

THE
MORAL SYSTEM
OF
M O S E S.

BY SAMUEL PYE, M. D. *R*
MEMBER of the COLLEGE of PHYSICIANS, LONDON;
Author of The MOSAIC THEORY of the SOLAR or PLANETARY SYSTEM.



L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR;
And Sold by J. DODSLEY, in Pall-Mall; T. LONGMAN, in Pater-noster Row;
W. BROWN, the Corner of Essex-street, in the Strand; Mr. PRINCE, at Oxford;
and Mr. MERRIL, at Cambridge.

MDCCLXX.

THE
M. O. T. A. L. S. Y. S. T. E. M.

M. O. T. A. L. S. Y. S. T. E. M.

BY SAMUEL F. M. D.

Member of the Council of the American Medical Association
Author of "The Science of the Human Body" and "The Science of the Human Mind"



- 1

T H E

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. I.	
OF the Moral Attributes of God	Page 1
C H A P. II.	
Of the Moral System of Moses	8
C H A P. III.	
Of the Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil	15
C H A P. IV.	
Of the Institution of the Moral Government of God in Eden	28
C H A P. V.	
Of the Old Serpent	39
C H A P. VI.	
Of the Formation of the Woman	49
C H A P. VII.	
Of the Fall	51
C H A P. VIII.	
The Temptation	57

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Fall of Adam — — — 64

CHAP. X.

Of the Origin of Shame — — — 72

CHAP. XI.

The Examination of the Offenders — — — 75

CHAP. XII.

The Sentence passed on the different Parties concerned in the Fall.

On the Serpent — — — 78

CHAP. XIII.

The Sentence on the Woman — — — 87

CHAP. XIV.

The Sentence on the Man — — — 90

CHAP. XV.

An Appendix to Chap. III. Of the Tree of Life — — 93

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Origin of Sacrifices — — — 101

CHAP. XVII.

The History of Cain and Abel — — — 108

CHAP. XVIII.

A Digression on the Mark set upon Cain — — — 119

Of the Mark set upon Cain — — — 123

7 DEGI

NAMES

N A M E S

OF THE

S U B S C R I B E R S.

A.

MR. Adams, apothecary
 Mrs. Arbourough
 Mark Akenfide, M. D.

B.

Mr. Bafden, sen. apothecary
 Mr. Robert Batson, 2 copies
 Lady Beaumont, 2 copies
 John Bird, Esq; alderman of London
 Mr. John Bowles
 Mr. Broughton
 John Brown, Esq; 2 copies
 Rev. Dr. Butler
 Henry Blake, Esq;
 Henry Brooke, Esq;

C.

Rev. Mr. Carter, lecturer of Barking
 Rev. Dr. Cawley, rector of Stepney,
 2 copies
 Mrs. Cawley, 2 copies
 Dr. Matthew Clarke, 8 copies
 Mr. Clarke
 Miss Chitty, of Hackney
 Mr. Cock, of Mile-end
 Mrs. Collman, of Mile-end, widow,
 2 copies

Rev. Mr. Colley, sen. lecturer of Stepney
 Rev. Mr. Colley, jun. curate of Stepney
 Mr. Cooper, of Poplar
 Mr. Cotton, attorney at law, Hackney
 Dr. De la Cour, 4 copies
 Mr. Court, of Mile-end
 Mr. Cox, apothecary, of Ratcliff
 — Crane, Esq; surgeon
 Rev. Mr. Cratcherode
 John Cook, Esq; of Stratford, 4 copies
 Mr. John Channing

D.

Mr. Dale, Surgeon, of Stratford
 Dr. Dawson
 Mr. Debonnair, 2 copies
 Mr. Dillworth
 The worshipful Dr. Ducarel
 Mr. Dyal
 Rev. Dr. Dickens

E.

Mr. Jonathan Eade
 John Ellicot, Esq; F. R. S.
 Mr. Everet

F.

John Le Fevre, Esq;
 Dr. Fothergil, 20 copies

NAMES OF THE SUBSCRIBERS.

Rev. Mr. Foxley
Mr. Flower Freeman, 2 copies
Rev. Dr. Furneaux
Mrs. Katherine Ford
Miss Katherine Ford

Mr. David Jennings
Lewis Jones, Esq;
Samuel Jones, Esq; of Stepney, 4 copies
Mrs. Jones, of Stepney, 2 copies
Dr. Samuel Johnson, 4 copies
Rev. Dr. Jubb

G.

David Garrick, Esq; 2 copies
Rev. Mr. Gordon
—— Gordon, Esq; Bromley
Mr. James Gordon, Botanist
John Grace, Esq; Bromley
Mr. Grace, jun.

Dr. Goldsmith
Mr. Greaves, of Limehouse, Ship-
builder, 2 copies

H.

Mr. Minson Hales, surgeon
Mr. Robert Hales, surgeon
John Haggard, Esq; 4 copies
Rev. Mr. John Haggard, 2 copies
Mr. William Haggard, Boston, Lin-
colnshire, 2 copies
—— Harrison, Esq; of Reading
Mr. Harwood
Mr. Hall, Banker
Joseph Hankey, Esq; 2 copies
Mr. Hawes
Mr. Hill
Captain Hood
Rev. Dr. Hunt, Regius prof. Heb. at
Oxford
Mr. Hynam, surgeon
William Hunter, M. D.
Rev. Mr. Humphries
Mr. Higginson
Mr. Hopkins, 2 copies

I.

Mrs. Jennings
Mr. Joseph Jennings, 2 copies

K.

Rev. Dr. Kennicott, prebendary of
Westminster
Mr. Kimpton

L.

Right Hon. and Right Rev. Lord
Bishop of Landaff
Right Hon. the Earl of Litchfield
Dr. Lawrence, president of the college
of physicians, 2 copies
Rev. Mr. Lawrence, rector of St. Mary
Aldermanbury
James Lee, Esq; of Hackney, 2 copies
Mr. Lee, of Mile-end, surgeon, 2 copies
Mr. Lermetto
Dr. Letch
Mr. Lewin, of Hackney
Mr. Ludwell

M.

Rev. Mr. Manesty, 2 copies
Mrs. Manning, of Hackney, widow
Mr. George Marten, of Lime-house,
surgeon, 2 copies
William Martin, Esq;
Colonel Fleming Martin
Captain Martin
Rev. Dr. Markham, rector of White-
chapel, 2 copies
Mr. Mudge
Rev. Mr. Muir, 2 copies
Mr. Murray, surgeon
Mr. Murrell, surgeon

NAMES OF THE SUBSCRIBERS.

N.

Mr. Newton, of Hackney, 2 copies
Abraham North, Esq;

O.

Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Oxford
Dr. Van Oven

P.

Ed. Page, Esq; of Tottenham, 2 copies
Rev. Mr. Palmer, of Hackney
Mr. Patten, of Ratcliff, surgeon
Dr. Pitcairn, 4 copies
Mr. Paterfon, 6 copies
Mr. Payne
Rev. Mr. Michael Pope
Mr. Pearce

R.

John Redman, Esq; of Mile-end
Rev. Dr. Ridley, prebendary of Salif-
bury, 4 copies
Mrs. Ann Ridley, of Clapton, widow,
4 copies
William Rivet, Esquire
Mr. Ryan
Rev. Dr. Rotheram
Sir Joshua Reynolds
Mr. Rogers
Mr. John Randall, ship-builder, 3 copies

S.

The Right Hon. Earl of Shaftesbury
Rev. Dr. Gregory Sharpe, master of
the Temple
Mr. Sanderfon

Captain Slater

Rev. Jos. Sims, prebend. of St. Paul's,
2 copies

Mr. Richard Smith, of Lime-house,
surgeon

Mr. Smith, of Ratcliff

George Colson Smith, Esq; of Poplar

Mr. Stratton

Mr. Spalding

George Steevens, Esq; 4 copies

Dr. Silvester, 2 copies

Mr. Sweetwood, of Lime-house, 4 copies

Rev. Dr. Stinton, chancellor of Lincoln

T.

Rev. Mr. Richard Thoresby

Mr. Toulmin, sen. surgeon

Mr. Toulmin, jun. of Hackney, surgeon

Mr. Samuel Toulmin, attorney at law

Mr. Tredway

Mr. Tree, of Mile-end, 2 copies

Mr. Turpin, of Buckingham

Mrs. Thrale

James Taylor, Esq;

V.

Mr. Vaughan, of Mile-end.

W.

— Wainwright, Esq;

Mr. Warmborn, surgeon

Robert Wastfield, Esq; of Mile-end,
3 copies

Rev. Mr. Watkins, of Poplar

Mr. Watts, of Mile-end

Mr. Whitehead, surgeon, Shadwell

Mr. Wilkinson, of Bow, surgeon

Mr. White

T H E

MORAL SYSTEM

OF

M O S E S.

CHAP. I.

Of the Moral Attributes of God.

THE physical system of Moses having been opened, in a free and familiar conversation between *Moses* and *Bolingbroke*, and minutely explained, on rational and philosophical principles, in the *Mosaic Theory of the Solar, or Planetary System*; whereby the inspiration of the author of the Book of *Genesis* has been established, we may now, with the greater propriety attempt a vindication of the same divine writer in the moral system he has given us.

But as a moral system necessarily supposes moral perfections in the Divine Being, let us see what foundation there is in the nature and reason of things, abstractedly from revelation, to conclude, that the Divine Being is possessed of such perfections.

B

If

If the fixed stars be centres of systems, similar to the solar, being all constructed with similar design, they must be under the dominion of one, intelligent, powerful being (1).

And if the planets of the solar, and of those other innumerable systems, being constructed with similar design, be like our earth, they were not created in vain, but like our earth were formed to be inhabited (2).

If they be inhabited, it is most reasonable to conclude, that as our earth, they likewise were made for, and possessed by, rational and intelligent creatures.

Now as the natural perfections of this one, intelligent, powerful Being are manifested to every rational and intelligent creature, so the most amiable of his moral perfections, is as evidently declared by his giving existence to rational and intelligent creatures.

For we cannot conceive that a Being of infinite natural perfections should ever give existence to rational and intelligent creatures, except with a design to manifest those perfections, and at the same time to communicate happiness to such creatures.

But to give existence, and communicate happiness to his creatures, is a moral perfection; benevolence, therefore, or a disposition to do good, or to communicate happiness, must be as essential to the Divine Being, as wisdom and power.

And if benevolence, the most amiable of moral perfections, be essential to the Divine Being, he must necessarily be possessed of every other moral perfection.

(1) Sir Isaac Newton's General Scholium.

(2) Isa, xlv. 18.

Benevolence, it is true, is the only moral perfection that can be demonstrated a priori, because it is that perfection alone that the Creator could manifest to his rational and intelligent creatures till he should have subjected them to his moral government; but as rational and intelligent creatures, as such, were manifestly made for moral government, whenever this government should take place in any rank or order of rational and intelligent beings, every moral perfection, necessary in a governor of such beings, would necessarily appear, in consequence of the conduct and behaviour of the governed.

If these general deductions be consonant to reason, they must be conclusive to every reasonable creature; not only to the rational and intelligent inhabitants of every planet in the universe, but (if there be any superior intelligences) to every other order of beings, whose rank in the intellectual system may be beyond our conception.

But as the proof of these other moral perfections of the Deity to the several orders of rational and intelligent creatures, depends upon the condition and circumstances of those orders, when first they received their being; and upon the terms of their subjection to the Sovereign Lord of the Universe; the application of the above deductions can only be made by those orders of beings, separately, and independently of every other order in the universe.

Hence the necessity of a particular revelation to every order of rational and intelligent beings; and therefore it is impossible for the inhabitants of any one planet, to know the condition and circumstances of the inhabitants of any other planet, even of the same system, much more of the existence of any superior order of intelligences, without an express revelation.

Hence, likewise, the extreme absurdity of those, who apply to the universe what can only be proved of one of the least of the planets of our system; of those, who, from the present state and condition of our world, in which much natural and moral evil abound, weakly, yet boldly conclude, "That there is in the universal system of things, much misery and wickedness, that is much natural and moral evil (1).

For if the inhabitants of *Jupiter*, for instance, cannot possibly, without a special revelation, be acquainted with the original state and condition in which man was created, and his fall from that state, they must necessarily be totally ignorant of the present condition and circumstances of our world: and though misery and wickedness, that is natural and moral evil, should abound in *Jupiter*, even to a much greater degree, than on our earth, those that inhabit that planet, would from thence falsely conclude, that natural or moral evil, had any place on this globe.

For the same reason, as it is impossible for us to know unless it were revealed to us, what is the present state and condition of the inhabitants of *Jupiter*, we should as falsely conclude that they are wicked and miserable, because there is in our world much misery and wickedness, that is much natural and moral evil; for, "all the inhabitants of some other planet may have been, perhaps, from their creation, united in one great society, speaking the same language, and living under the same government, or TOO PERFECT BY THEIR NATURE TO NEED THE RESTRAINT OF ANY (2)."

(1) Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil, 3d edit. p. 15.

(2) *Bolingbroke's Posthumous Works*, Vol. IV. p. 45. edit. 8vo.

If this should be the case with respect to the planet *Jupiter*, (and by supposition it is a possible case) it may as reasonably be supposed of every planet in the universe, except that which we inhabit. And on this supposition, if from the absence of evil on *Jupiter* or any other planet, their inhabitants should conclude, that in the universal system of things there is no misery, no wickedness, that is no natural and moral evil, we know by woeful experience their conclusion would be false, from what we feel of the misery and wickedness, of the natural and moral evil, that abound on this unhappy globe.

The question then concerning the origin of evil in our world, since evil may have no place in any other planet, must, by us, be confined to our own.

“ ’Tis ours to trace it only in our own (1).”

Now since there are no *data* in philosophy, natural or moral, on which to found any rational conjecture, much less any solid argument on this important question, it is necessary to begin our enquiry with the beginning of things, with the beginning of the system in which we are placed : and this naturally leads us to revelation, that is to the history of the creation, and formation of the system.

As it is impossible that any one of the numberless material systems which compose that mighty whole the universe, should have come out of the hands of the Creator less perfect, than infinite wisdom could contrive, and infinite power could effect ; so it is impossible that a Being of infinite perfections, natural and moral, should create any rational and intelligent beings, less perfect in their

(1) Thro' worlds unnumber'd, tho' the God be known,

'Tis ours to trace him only in our own. *Ethic Epistles.*

respective natures, than the frame of the solar or planetary system, and the creatures that inhabit every planet in that system, were perfect in their different natures; and accordingly we find, that when the material system was finished, and the several planets were furnished with inhabitants, God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good (1).

If, therefore, there be any imperfection in any part of this creation, any evil, natural or moral, it must necessarily have proceeded from the creature: and if in the nature of things every effect must have an adequate cause (how difficult soever the investigation of the cause may be) the very existence of NATURAL, necessarily infers MORAL EVIL.

For, by supposition, the rational and intelligent creatures on every planet in the system, were created in the perfection of their respective natures; and, therefore, as they received their natures from a Being infinite in the moral perfections of his nature, they must have been created perfect, morally perfect; and consequently, so long as they should retain their original moral perfection, they must have continued as free from, all *natural*, as they would have been strangers to, all *moral* evil.

For, if there be any such thing in nature, as pain, trouble, sorrow, remorse, or any *natural* evil whatsoever, it must, in the nature of things, be in consequence of some *moral* evil. The connexion is so close between the two, that one can have no existence without the other. *Pain*, is a word of extensive signification, but the first and original idea affixed to it, is that of *punishment* (2), for the breach

(1) Gen. i. 31.

(2) So close is the connexion between *iniquity* (or sin and wickedness in general) and *punishment*, that the two ideas being considered by the sacred writers of the Old Testa-

breach of some law, and includes in it every thing that lessens in any degree, or totally deprives of, the happiness which the offender was, or might have been possessed of, if he had not offended.

But as rational and intelligent creatures of every rank in the scale of beings were endowed with a power of choosing or refusing, however perfect they were when first they received their existence, they might possibly (because they were free agents) lose that original perfection of their nature, by choosing evil and refusing good. Now since it is a contradiction in terms to suppose, that beings, morally perfect, could choose evil, moral evil, whilst the perfect law of their nature continued the sole rule of their action; that is before, by some positive law for the trial of their obedience, they were subjected to the moral government of their natural Lord and Sovereign; a moral system must necessarily be supposed to have been communicated to the several orders of rational and intelligent creatures, and the terms of their subjection settled by him that made them.

Leaving then every other order of beings to themselves, since this world is our home, let us attend to that system of action, which was in the beginning of his existence communicated to the father of mankind; that is to the human nature, when the human nature centred in *Adam* alone; for, as we shall soon see, the law was given to *Adam* before the formation of Eve.

Testament, in the relation of cause and effect, are very frequently expressed by one and the same word. And here it is worthy of observation, that both the *Greeks* and the *Romans* (according to their notion of punishment in another state, for crimes committed in this life) call the avengers of those crimes, Πονηρ, *Pænæ*; and they were named by the *Romans* *Furiæ*, from the rage and madness with which they filled the consciences of the wicked. *Pænæ* atrocibus delectis, præsertim cædibus irrogari credebantur a furijs—ita furiæ a furore quem conscientijs immittunt. *Vossij Idololatr.* LIB. viii. cap. 18.

CHAP. II.

Of the Moral System of Moses.

WE have in some former papers observed (1) " That the
 " magnificent doctrine of all the planetary inhabitants
 " makes it probable in the highest degree (if it does not prove, as
 " far as the nature of the thing will admit) that revelation runs
 " parallel with creation in every system of rational and intelligent
 " creatures." And indeed, so close is the connexion between a
physical, and a *moral system*, on the supposition of a revelation to
 the inhabitants of any planet, that it is not easy to conceive, why
 the Creator should condescend to give any of his creatures an ac-
 count of the creation of their planet, and the system to which it
 belongs, unless it were to lay a foundation for the subjection of its
 inhabitants to him, as the sovereign Lord of the Universe.

That this was the true reason of the divine procedure with re-
 spect to the inhabitants of our globe, is evident from this single
 consideration, to wit, That in the very midst of the account of
 creation, before the material system was finished, and before the
 formation of man, the foundation of a moral system was laid, in
 the formation of the vegetable world. For in a garden, the moral
 government of God was to be instituted, and by the fruit of a tree,
 was man's obedience to be tried. Accordingly, since man, and the
 numerous tribes of living creatures, were to be formed, of the sub-

(1) *Moses and Bolingbroke.*

stance of the earth, and were to be maintained and preserved in life by the fruits of the same earth, as soon as the globe was made habitable, by the separation of the waters from the dry land, even before the formation of any thing that had life, God provided food for all flesh, when he said,

Gen. i. 11. *Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth : and it was so.*

Ver. 12. *And the earth brought forth grass [every tender plant] and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself, after his kind : and God saw that it was good.*

Ver. 20. *And [when on the fourth day of our earth the material system was finished, and the several worlds that roll about our sun, were in every respect fitted for the reception of their future inhabitants] God said [with respect to our planet] Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly in the open firmament of heaven.*

Ver. 21. *And [as the formation of living creatures from lifeless matter, and the production of inanimate matter from nothing, required the same Almighty power ; and as with the same infinite ease, the hugest of the watery tribe, and the inhabitants of the more fluid air, even of the smallest wing, were to be produced from the same fleeting and unstable element, Moses does not say God made, but] God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl [and insect] after his kind : and God saw that it was good.*

Ver. 22. *And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas [rivers and lakes] and let fowl multiply in the earth.*

Ver. 23. *And the evening and the morning were the fifth day.*

Ver. 24. *And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth, after his kind: and it was so.*

Ver. 25. *And [as the earth had no more vivifying power communicated to it than the waters had, to prepare it for bringing forth the living creatures that were formed from it] God made [formed, fashioned] the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.*

Let the waters bring forth abundantly—Let the earth bring forth—the creatures that were to be formed from their respective substances, were the only preface to their production: but how sublime and Godlike soever this manner of speaking may express the all-powerful will of the Creator; yet as he designed this earth to be inhabited by creatures, of a much more noble and exalted nature than any that had yet received their being from the waters or the earth; the creating language of the Deity rises, in proportion to the superior dignity of the last and greatest of his works below.

Ver. 26. *And [the Son, whom the Father hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his substance (1); even the Son of] God said, Let us make man in our image, after*

(1) Heb. i. 1—3.

our

our likenes (1); and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Ver. 27. *So [the Son of] God created man in his own image, [a rational, intelligent, and free agent] in the image of God [in the moral perfections of his nature] created he him: male and female created he them.*

Ver. 28. *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish [fill] the earth [with sons and daughters in your own image, after your likenes] and subdue it: [let it be subject to you and your posterity] and have [the] dominion [which I hereby grant to you and yours] over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.*

Ver. 29. *And God said, Behold, [take particular notice, that] I have [freely] given you [and yours] every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth [without any exception] and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: to you [and to no other creature] it shall be for meat: [for food to support your natural life].*

Ver. 30. *And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given [not any fruit of a tree, but] every green herb for meat: and it was so.*

(1) "Man is made after the lykenes of God, in that he hath a soule immortal, indued with understandyng and other divine qualities. Yet seemeth it rather in thys place to be spoken of that similitude, or lykenes wherein God did afterward appear unto man, which was the shappe appointed afore to be the shape of Christ the second persone in Trinitie, when hee should shewe himselfe to the worlde and suffer in the same." *Tindale's Bible; London, 1549.*

Ver. 31. *And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.*

From so very particular and minute an account of the original of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, before the formation of man, to whom the earth was now given, with full dominion over it, and every living creature in the sea, in the air, and on the earth, it is evident, that man was the final cause of this terraqueous globe. And from the history of the formation of man, it is as evident, that very soon after he was made a living soul, he was subjected to the moral government of the Lord of the creation. But previous to this solemn transaction, it pleased the Creator to reveal himself to his new creature in a very particular manner; and as God had made man in his own image, a rational and intelligent being, he treated him as such immediately upon his creation, by speaking to him all the words of the blessing wherewith he blessed the first human pair (1). But since the words of this blessing, and of the appointment of the different food to them, and to every other creature, are but a continuation of the preceding history, we must by no means imagine that these were the first words that God spake to Adam; for when the heavens and the earth were finished, on the sixth day, and on the seventh, God had rested, ceased, from the work of creation, he blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; to

(1) ——— “ I am compelled to acknowledge, that the same beneficent hand
“ that created him (Adam) did direct him, and communicate to him the knowledge
“ of such things as were necessary for him to know in his first state of existence;
“ and this communication between man and his Maker, I take to have been the
“ original language.

“ And in fact we find, that the Creator did converse with *Adam*, and that the first
“ man and woman had the use of language, which it is impossible that they could,
“ in so short time, and to such perfection, have contrived for themselves; for *Adam*
“ must not be supposed to have been unskilful in the primitive language, when he is
“ said to have given names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of
“ the field.” Gen. ii. 19, 20. Dr. Gregory Sharpe’s *Origin of Languages*, p. 4, 5.

whom

whom did he bless and sanctify this day, but to Adam? Now if this seventh day was set apart to *Adam* as a day of holy rest, he must have been informed of the reason of this institution, to wit, because God had rested from all his work which God had created to make: but this reason could have been no reason to him, unless he had been previously acquainted with the whole process of the six days work. The account, therefore, of the creation and formation of the system delivered to us by the writer of the Book of *Genesis*, must have been originally communicated to *Adam*, immediately before the institution of the sabbath.

If in this view we may be permitted to consider the account of creation, as given to *Adam*, it will appear worthy of a revelation from Him who made the heavens and the earth, when the father of mankind should discover to her who was bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, what was delivered to him by God when he said,

In the beginning I created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And my spirit moved upon the face of the waters. And I said, Let there be light, and there was light. And I saw every thing that I had made, and behold it was very good: and the evening and the morning were the sixth day (1).

(1) From this singular representation of the Creator's communicating to Adam the history of the creation, it is very natural to infer that *Moses* might have received his account of the beginning of things by tradition from the descendants of Adam; for considering the great ages of the patriarchs, such tradition might pass only thro' five or six hands from *Adam* to him: but if this Mosaic account of creation comes to us from no higher authority, it will not, it ought not, to be received on the faith of tradition.

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, even all the host of them.

And on this seventh day I have ended my work which I have made: and I now rest on this seventh day, from all my work which I have made: and I [therefore] bless the seventh day and sanctify it, because that in it I have rested from all my work, which I created to make.

C H A P. III.

Of the Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (1).

AS when, in the *Physical System*, the several bodies were made fit for the mechanical purposes for which they were designed by the Creator, he subjected them to such laws, as were suited to the nature of matter; to wit, to the general laws of motion, by which they were to be governed; so in the *Moral System*, when

GENESIS II. 7.

The Lord God had formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul [a rational, intelligent, and free agent].

Ver. 8. *The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man, whom he had formed [for the trial of his obedience].*

For though *Adam* was created perfect, morally perfect, and, therefore, needed not any other rule of action, than the law of his nature, which was wrought, as it were, in his constitution, and which he could not break whilst he should be under the sole direction of that law (2); it pleased the Sovereign Lord of rational

(1) "What this tree of knowledge of good and evil was, is as great a mystery to us, as what the tree of life was: for we understand neither of them, which makes some men, who would not be thought to be ignorant of any thing, to fly to allegorical senses: but though I would be glad to know if I could, yet I must be contented to leave it a mystery as I find it." *Sherlock upon Death*, p. 76. edit. 22.

and intelligent beings to found his government of the human nature not on his own absolute will and pleasure, but on the free choice of creatures, made free to choose or to refuse—free to eat or not to eat, of the fruit of a tree in the garden of God. Let us then see what *Moses* has said, and what may fairly be deduced from what he has said concerning this ever-memorable tree.

GEN. II. 9.

And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree, that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food: the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, EVEN the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Ver. 15. And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden, to dress it, and to keep it.

Ver. 16. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat:

Ver. 17. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.

GEN. III. 1.

Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, which the Lord God had made: and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

Ver. 2. And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

Ver. 3. But of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

Ver. 4. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.

Ver. 5. For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened: and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

Ver.

THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE. 17

Ver. 6. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.

Ver. 7. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.

From this short account, the following propositions are evident.

PROPOSITION I.
That free liberty was granted to the man, and to the woman, to eat of every tree in the garden except one only, *Gen. ii. 16. iii. 2, 3.*

PROP. II.

That there was one tree in the midst of the garden, *ii. 9. iii. 3.*

PROP. III.

That one tree, and only one, was forbidden, on pain of death, *ii. 17. iii. 3.*

PROP. IV.

That the tree of life was situate in the midst of the garden, by name, *ii. 9.*

PROP. V.

That the tree of knowledge of good and evil was forbid on pain of death, by name, *ii. 17.*

PROP. VI.

That the tree situate in the midst of the garden was forbid on pain of death, *iii. 3.*

PROP. VII.

That there was one tree in the midst of the garden, of which both the woman and the man did eat, *iii. 6, 12, 13.*

There was, therefore, but one tree in the garden of *Eden*, distinguished from the rest, both by its situation, and its appointment.

“ Out of the ground (in this garden) made the Lord God to grow,

But

D

“ every

"every tree that was pleasant to the sight, and good for food (1).
 "The tree of life also (1) in the midst of the garden, even (2) the
 "tree of knowledge of good and evil." There was, therefore, no
 tree of life, different and distinct from that of the tree of know-
 ledge of good and evil. And because free liberty was granted to
Adam to eat of every tree in the garden, except one, every fruit-
 tree except one, was good for food: the excepted tree, therefore,
 by whatever name it was called, was not good for food; and con-
 sequently was never designed to be tasted, though it had not been
 forbidden. The tree of life, therefore, and the tree of knowledge
 of good and evil, were different names to one, even to the same
 tree, in the midst of the garden.

ARGUMENT I.

For, if the tree of life had been a tree different from that of the
 knowledge of good and evil, it might have been eat of, by
 Prop. I.

But the tree of life was forbidden,

Therefore the tree of life could not possibly have been a tree diffe-
 rent from that of the knowledge of good and evil.

For the tree that was forbidden, was in the midst of the garden,
 Prop. VI.

(1) Every tree that was good for food: the tree of life ALSO—The tree of life,
 therefore, was not good for food.

(2) That the conjunctive particle *Vau*, which we translate AND, should be render-
 ed EVEN, will appear very evident, from the arguments annexed, as well as from the
 like use of it in the Old, and of the particle *Kai*, in the New Testament, where they
 cannot possibly, be copulative, but exegetical, or explanatory, *Zech.* ix. 9. Behold
 thy King cometh—riding upon an ass, and [even] upon a colt the foal of an ass. It
 is the same in St. *Matth.* xxi. 5. for it was not only impossible for *Jesus* to ride upon
 both at the same time, but St. *Mark* says to his disciples, ye shall find a colt *whereon*
never man sat, xi. 2. And St. *John*, in the parallel place quoting the same prophecy,
 says expressly, thy King cometh—sitting on an ass's colt. See also *Gen.* iv. 4. *Jer.*
xl. 26. *1 Cor.* xv. 24. *2 Cor.* i. 3. *Rom.* xv. 6, God and [even] the Father.

But

THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE. 119

But the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, Prop. VI.
Therefore the tree of life was the tree that was forbidden.

ARG. II.

For, if the two different names denoted two different trees, either the tree of life only, or only the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was forbidden, Prop. I.

Now if the tree of life only was forbidden, where was the tree of knowledge, &c.?

For there was but one tree forbidden, Prop. I.

And but one tree eaten of, Prop. VII.

On this supposition, there could be no tree of knowledge, &c. in the garden, contrary to Prop. V.

But if the tree of knowledge, &c. only was forbidden, where was the tree of life?

For there was but one tree forbidden, on pain of death, Prop. III. and but one that was eaten of, which was situate in the midst of the garden, Prop. VII.

Therefore there could be no tree of life distinct, and different from the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

ARG. III.

For, if the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, Prop. IV.

And if the tree forbidden was in the midst of the garden, Prop. VI.

And if the tree of which both the woman and her husband did eat, was in the midst of the garden, Prop. VII.

Then, the tree in the midst of the garden,

The tree forbidden,

And the tree of which both the woman and her husband did eat, was one, even the same tree, with two names—The tree of life, in the midst of the garden; even the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: in the first of which, life, continued life, or immortality, was virtually promised, as the reward of their obedience; that is, on condition they never had tasted of its fruit; and to the other name, death was expressly annexed,

as the certain punishment of their disobedience to the Divine command, if ever they should dare to eat of its forbidden fruit.

ARG. IV.

The tree in the midst of the garden was forbidden, on pain of death, Prop. VI.

But the tree in the midst of the garden was the tree of life, Prop. IV.

Therefore, the tree of life was forbidden on pain of death; which is a contradiction in terms, if the tree of life was a tree distinct and different from that of the knowledge of good and evil, and was to have been eaten of to procure immortality: but if the two names were given to one and the same tree, these different conclusions are demonstrably true; for,

There was but one tree forbidden on pain of death, Prop. III.

And that tree was in the midst of the garden, Prop. VI.

And the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, Prop. IV.

From these conclusions, therefore, it is evident, that if the woman, and her husband with her, had not eat of the tree forbidden, either by the name of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or by its situation, in the midst of the garden, they never could have died; or, in other words, the tree of knowledge of good and evil would have been to them the tree of life, and the tree in the midst of the garden would have been to them (what the Lord God had, by its very name, promised them it should be, on this sole condition) the tree of life; but as they did eat, notwithstanding God called it the tree of life, it was really and truly the tree of death.

There is not, perhaps, in the whole Bible, so striking an allusion to any antient fact, as that passage of St. Paul is, to this double name of the tree, and the use the Serpent made of it in the temptation, which procured the fall. "The commandment [the command concerning the tree in the midst of the garden] which was ordain-

THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE. 21

ordained [designed] for life (for which reason God gave it the name of the tree of life) the woman found to be unto death. For the Serpent taking occasion by the commandment [the command concerning the same tree in the midst of the garden, forbidden under the name of the tree of knowledge of good and evil] deceived the woman, and by it slew her (1)."

But this naturally leads us to enquire into the true meaning of the term *knowledge*, in that name of the tree by which it was forbidden—*The tree of the knowledge of good and evil*.

Amongst the various senses of the word *knowledge*, there are two principal ones; for to *know*, is either to *understand*, or *perceive*, which is an act of the *understanding*; or to *choose*, and in consequence of this choice, to *approve*, *love*, *delight in*, which is an act of the *will*: by the first, we are rational and intelligent creatures; by the other, we are constituted free agents. Now since the *Serpent*, the first commentator on the words of God; the father of critics, insinuated to the woman, that *knowledge* in the name of the tree by which it was forbidden, was a synonymous word for *wisdom* (for he told her that their eyes, the eyes of their understanding, should be opened, and they should be as Gods, *knowing* good and evil; and when the woman saw that the tree was—a tree to be desired to make one *wise*); since the woman was deceived by this piece of criticism, which was the sole occasion of the fall of our general mother, it is impossible that the word *knowledge*, in the name of the tree by which it was forbidden, could bear any other sense, than that of *choice*, and the consequent *approbation* of good or evil.

There was, therefore, but one tree, the fruit of which our first parents were forbid to eat, or so much as to touch it (for it was

(1) Rom. vii. 10, 11.

pleasant to the sight) left by touching, they might be tempted to eat, and thereby forfeit all title to that life, continued life, or immortality, which was to be the reward of their obedience to the Divine Command; for which sole reason it was emphatically, and with Divine Propriety, named, *The tree of life*.

For in the promulgation of this law, life and death were evidently set before the father of mankind. The command concerning the tree in the midst of the garden, was a law, properly so called; to which was affixed a double sanction; of reward, that is, of life, continued life, or immortality, on condition of obedience, manifestly promised in the first name of the tree (for God first called the tree in the midst of the garden, the tree of life, though he afterwards gave it the name of the tree of knowledge of good and evil); and the sanction of punishment, on the threatening of death in the express words of the law.

But this command was not only a law properly so called, established only with a threatening; it had the formal nature of a covenant, or law, with a promise annexed on condition of obedience, contained in the first name of the tree, *the tree of life*. And if we consider the words of Moses to the children of Israel, in either of these views, as a law, or a covenant, they will in a very lively and striking manner illustrate, and confirm, if they do not rather manifestly refer to, this first and grand transaction between the Creator and the father of mankind. "See, I have set before thee this day
" LIFE and GOOD, and DEATH and EVIL. — I call heaven and
" earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you
" LIFE and DEATH, BLESSING and CURSING; therefore CHOOSE
" LIFE, THAT BOTH THOU AND THY SEED MAY LIVE (1)."

Here then we have the most plain and evident reasons for the

(1) Deut. xxx. 15, 19.

double name of the tree, which was to be the test of man's obedience. If the command concerning it under this double name, be considered as a law properly so called, the sanction of reward is expressed, and promised in the name, *tree of life*: if it be considered as a covenant, life is promised in that name; and the tree itself was the token of that covenant; and so long as that covenant should have continued unbroken, it would have been a pledge, and an earnest of life; and if it should have for ever remained unbroken, it would have been a sure and certain pledge and earnest of continued life or immortality, as the gracious reward of continued innocence, that is, of never-ceasing obedience. And this remarkable citation from *Moses*, will fix and for ever determine the true meaning of the other name of the tree, by which it was forbidden, to wit, the tree of the KNOWLEDGE (1), the tree of the CHOICE, of good and evil.

That the nature of this tree has been universally misunderstood is very evident from the almost universal opinion, that there were in the garden of *Eden* two peculiar and remarkable trees; the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and in consequence of this opinion it is almost universally maintained, that the use of the tree of life was, to render, or preserve man immortal. "Tis certain," says the great Dr. BULL, "the tree of life was so called, because it was either a sacrament and divine sign, or else a natural means of immortality; that is, because he that should have used it would (either by the natural virtue of the tree itself continually repairing the decays of nature, or else by

(1) And thou, *Solomon*, my son, *know, choose*, thou the God of thy fathers, *1 Chron.* xxviii. 9.

You only have I *known, chosen*, of all the families of the earth, *Amos* iii. 2.

Behold thou desireth truth in the inward parts, and in the hidden parts thou shalt make me to *know*, to choose, and approve wisdom, *Psal.* li. 6.

The Lord knoweth, approveth, the way of the righteous, *Psal.* i. 6.

"the power of God) have lived for ever, as God himself plainly assures us." *Gen. iii. 22, 23, 24 (1).*

The learned Dr. KING goes further, and says, "Not that any tree, by any natural virtue, could preserve us immortal; but since God commanded man to eat of it, as often as he needed to be restored in his body, he surely was ready and able to convey his supernatural assistance, and make it effectual to the design for which it was appointed (2)."

That there was but one tree, has, we hope, been demonstrated beyond the possibility of a doubt: and that the tree of life was so far from being appointed, and in consequence of that appointment, commanded to be eat of, as often as man needed to be restored in his body, that it was solemnly forbid to be tasted, on pain of death: this has likewise been proved from the double name of the tree: but since the woman describes the forbidden tree by its situation alone, the tree in the midst of the garden, let us, for argument's sake, drop both the names of the tree, and let us suppose, that for the trial of man's obedience, God had planted a single tree in the midst of the garden, not distinguished from the rest, by any name, and had commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree in the midst of the garden, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Now it is extremely evident that this command would have been as binding, and the threatening of death as peremptory, as if the tree had been forbidden by the name of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Let me therefore ask, what would have been the consequence, if neither *Eve*, nor her husband with her, had eat of the fruit of

(1) Sermons and Discourses, Vol. III. p. 1069

(2) Sermon on the Fall of Man, second edit. p. 60.

this forbidden tree? forbidden by its situation alone, without any name, on pain of death? Would not the necessary consequence have been an absolute freedom from death, so long as they should have abstained from eating? And if they should for ever have abstained, would they not have been immortal? Life, therefore, continued life, or immortality, would have been the necessary consequence of their continued obedience to the Divine Command, though the tree of life had never been mentioned in the History of the Fall.

To say therefore, "That such animals as have solid bodies, are
 " by nature mortal, and cannot live for ever, without violence done
 " to the laws of nature, of matter and motion: And, therefore,
 " that there must have been either none at all created, or such as
 " are naturally mortal; the imperfection of matter could not suffer
 " it to be otherwise:" To say thus, is vainly to limit the power of
 the Omnipotent (1), and flatly to deny the scriptural account of the
 intro-

(1) *Is vainly to limit the power of the Omnipotent.* That God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity, *Wisd.* ii. 23. if he had not sinned, is, I think, as evident as that he was made at all, if we pay any regard to the testimony of *Moses*: to say otherwise is to err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For, if the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and in consequence of this breath he became a *living soul*, what power on earth, or in hell (if he had not eat of the forbidden fruit) could have deprived him of that breath of life? or have caused him to cease to live and move? What could have robbed any of the herbs bearing seed, or the fruit of any tree yielding seed, of their virtues as food, to maintain and support that breath of life? What could have put the least fibre, or the smallest tube, in the curious human frame, out of order, whilst He who made, was at the same time the Governor of the World, and the Lord of Providence? Matter and motion, internal or external, could never have produced any change for the worse, in what God had made very good, without the consent of the Author of Matter, and the first Mover. He who at the creation established the power of gravity, and instituted the laws of motion, would for ever have secured the proper exertion of that power of gravity, and those laws of motion, in the preservation of the *human*, as he has hitherto done in the conservation of the *solar* system.

introduction of death into the world. For if death, that is the resolution of the body into its first principles, was threatned as a punishment for the first act of disobedience to the Divine Command, man's continued obedience to the same command would have intitled him to continued life or immortality (without the promise of life in the name of the tree) that is to an absolute exemption from being reduced to his original dust: for notwithstanding that he was formed of the dust of the ground, it was not because he was formed of dust, but because he had transgressed the Divine Command, by eating of the forbidden fruit, that God said to him—Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

If, therefore, life, continued life, or immortality, would have been the necessary consequence of man's abstaining from eating of the tree in the midst of the garden, abstractedly from either of its names, till his obedience should have been perfectly tried; this single consideration alone demonstrates the truth of what has been hinted above, to wit, that the command was not only a mere law established only with a threatning, but that it had the formal nature of a covenant, with a promise annexed (1).

The

TIME, though ever so old, could never have impaired the health, vigour, and beauty of the first human pair, unless THE ETERNAL should have consented; and this could never have happened, whilst God should continue the righteous judge of all the earth.

It was SIN, SIN ALONE, that could disturb the regular order, which the Creator had established in the human system; it was sin alone that commissioned time to impair the health, vigour, and beauty of the first human pair, and this it would certainly have effected, though there had been no other road to immortality than by old age.

(1) *The formal nature of a covenant.* The learned Bp. Bull being unacquainted with the reason of the name, and consequently of the nature of the tree of life, says, "The very commination itself"—*In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,* "manifestly implies a promise—this consequence is most firm: God threat-

" neth

The only objection to our interpretation is taken from a remarkable passage in Chap. iii. 22. *And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden.*

But as these words of the Creator open a new, and a very extraordinary scene in the History of the Fall, they shall be particularly considered in their place. In the mean time, if the nature and use of this famous tree has been explained on the principles of reason and common sense, as well as agreeably to the words of *Moses*, the objection can have no force; for if the supposed two trees were in reality but one, and in consequence of the sameness of the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the tree of life was forbidden on pain of death, it is absolutely impossible that the man should have been sent forth from the garden, lest he should eat of a tree of life, and live for ever, when by eating of that very tree, he had forfeited all right to the immortality which was promised him, on the sole condition of never tasting its fruit.

"neth death to the man if he eat of the forbidden fruit; therefore he promiseth life if he do not," *Discourses*, Vol. III. p. 1070. But with great submission, though the commination implies that if he did not eat, he should not die, yet it does not imply a promise; because, as we have just now said, man's continued obedience would have intitled him to an absolute exemption from being reduced to his original dust. If, therefore, a covenant be a law, with a promise (as *Dr. Bull* defines it, p. 1069) it cannot be proved, that God ever entered into a covenant of works with *Adam*, but when he forbid him to eat of the tree which he himself had named the tree of life, on the sole condition of his never eating of its fruit.

C H A P. IV.

*Of the Institution of the Moral Government of God,
in Eden.*

AS no government can subsist without a law, or laws, for the regulation of the behaviour of the governed, the moral government of God over mankind must have commenced in *Eden*, with the promulgation of a law, which may be termed a law *sui Generis*, as it was given to *Adam* in a state of innocence and perfection, and for the sole trial of his future obedience, and the obedience of every one, that, deriving his being from him, would partake of the same human nature.

For as the Fall necessarily supposes a state prior to that from which man fell by the breach of this law, he must have come out of the hands of the Creator, as perfect, in all the powers and faculties of body and mind, as the material system, to which he belongs, was perfect and complete when it was finished. Since then the present state of mankind is a state of imperfection and misery (the necessary consequence of guilt) which includes in it every thing that is contained in that comprehensive name *DEATH*; the state from which we are fallen, must have been a state of life (the stipulated consequence of innocence) which comprehends every thing that constitutes the idea of human perfection, and human happiness.

But as the subject of this law for the trial of man's obedience was the *KNOWLEDGE*, the *CHOICE*, and consequent *APPROBATION* OF

GOOD and EVIL, to understand the nature of this government, and the extent of this law, it is necessary to ascertain the determinate meaning of the terms good and evil.

“ *Good and evil* (says the great Mr. *Locke*) are nothing but pleasure and pain, or that which occasions or procures pleasure and pain to us. *Moral good and evil* then is only the conformity or disagreement of our voluntary actions to some law, whereby good or evil is drawn upon us by the will and power of the law-maker; which good and evil, pleasure or pain, attending our observance, or breach of the law, by the decree of the Law-maker, is that we call *reward* and *punishment*.

— “ Since it would be utterly in vain to suppose a rule set to the free actions of man, without annexing to it some enforcement of good and evil to determine his will, we must, wherever we suppose a law, suppose also some reward or punishment annexed to that law. It would be in vain for one intelligent being to set a rule to the actions of another, if he had it not in his power to reward the compliance with, and punish deviation from his rule, by some good and evil, that is not the natural produce and consequence of the action itself. For that being a natural convenience, or inconvenience, would operate of itself without a law. This, if I mistake not, is the true nature of all law properly so called (1).”

Now if this be the nature of all law properly so called, the moral government of God over the human nature must have commenced with the promulgation of a POSITIVE INJUNCTION; for such was the command given to *Adam*, concerning the tree in the midst of

(1) *Essay*, Book II. Chap. 28.

the garden ; which was a law properly so called, to which (as has been before observed) was affixed a double sanction of *reward*, to wit, of *life*, on condition of obedience, manifestly promised in the first name of the tree, and of *punishment*, or the threatening of *death*, in the express words of the law.

Hence it necessarily follows, that before the promulgation of this law, man stood in no need of any other rule of action, than that divine principle of REASON, which with great propriety is called, THE LAW OF NATURE, because it was the law of the human nature, originally implanted in the human nature, wrought as it were in the constitution of the human system. It seems, therefore, next to impossible, that a rational and intelligent creature, made perfect in a moral sense, should break any moral law in his state of innocence (1). What I would be understood to mean is, that before the promulgation of a positive law, the thoughts, inclinations, and voluntary actions of *Adam* (the same is to be understood of every other

(1) It seems, I say, next to impossible, because after the promulgation of a positive law, for the trial of his obedience, a morally-perfect being may be in such circumstances, that he may break a moral law, before he shall have transgressed a positive injunction, as we shall find was the case of *Adam*. Lord *Bolingbroke* does in a very striking manner illustrate and confirm this sentiment, by saying, "When we speak of moral obligations, either we mean nothing, or we mean we are tied, bound, [obligatio a ligando] and under an internal, that is, a moral necessity of conforming ourselves to those rules which are expressed in the constitution of our nature, and on the observation of which the happiness of our kind depends." Vol. III. p. 402.

"The moral necessity of acting agreeably to it [the divine law of nature] in order to secure that happiness, which we are determined irresistably to desire, is a first consideration, and is alone sufficient to create obligation. In discovering this law, we are led to discover the legislator : and will is added to invest obligation with all the forms of law ; the will of that Being who constituted the obligation when He made the human system, and who, by constituting the obligation, made and promulgated the law." Id. p. 402.

intelligent creature, before his subjection to the moral government of God) would be perfectly agreeable to the dictates of right reason; and, therefore, so long as he should remain under the sole direction of that naturally-perfect rule, he could not, in his thoughts, inclinations, or voluntary actions, have deviated from it.

“ Were men perfect (says Dr. *Sherlock*) both in their reason and wills, so that they could neither judge amiss, nor act amiss, they would then do that which is exactly right, and reasonable in every case (1).”

This is certainly a possible case; for though it be only supposed by the learned master of the Temple, on a very different argument, it was the case of *Adam*, when he came out of the hands of the Creator; he must have been, at that time, perfect both in his reason and in his will, so that he could neither judge amiss, nor act amiss, but would do that which was exactly right and reasonable in every case, till he should have some other rule of action prescribed to him by some positive injunction, concerning the doing, or forbearing to do, an action in its own nature indifferent, till commanded or forbidden by the decree of the Creator (2).

It is true this was the case of *Adam*, but of *Adam* alone; and this state of innocence and perfection, without a law properly so called, was of a very short duration, for it was before the formation of *Eve* that *Adam* received the law from his maker.

(1) *Sherlock's Discourses*, Vol. III. p. 219.

(2) “ That the trial of man's obedience should be by such a prohibition as is mentioned by *Moses*, seems perfectly rational, and adapted to the state of innocence: no moral precept could have been at all proper for that purpose, because there was then scarce a possibility of their transgressing any such: it must therefore have been some indifferent action, neither good nor bad, but so far only as it was commanded or forbidden.” *Universal Hist.* Vol. I. p. 131.

Now

Now this single circumstance of God's delivering the law to *Adam*, before the woman, who was bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, was formed, is one of the most material circumstances in the whole History of the Fall; and, if carefully attended to, will lead us into the most easy, natural, and just notions of the moral government of God, and shew us the force and extent of the law on which it was founded, and on which the happiness or misery of mankind did absolutely depend.

For immediately after the promulgation of this law, the Lord God said, *It is not good that man should be alone: I will make him an help meet for him.* Now as the work of creation was finished on the sixth day, and the man was alone after the promulgation of the law, this law was delivered to, or, if as we have said, it had the formal nature of a covenant, this covenant was established with the *man alone*, that is, with the human nature, which at that time centred in *Adam* (1): and as after this transaction, the woman was formed out of the man, and therefore partook of the human nature, (for she was bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh) and as the children that would derive their being from this pair, would neces-

(1) That the human nature, did at that time center in *Adam*, is evident from the following considerations:

I. That though the woman was not formed till after this solemn transaction; and, therefore, could receive the law from the mouth of *Adam* alone, yet she was sensible that the command in its full extent was equally binding on her as on her husband; for when the serpent put the question to her, concerning the prohibition of the tree—Yea, hath God said, YE shall not eat of every tree of the garden? she said unto him, WE may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, YE shall not eat of it, neither shall YE touch it, lest YE die.

II. That if mankind had increased in the state of innocence, every son and daughter of *Adam* would have been bound by the same law, and for the same reason as their mother was, because they would have received their being from him, as their mother had done.

family

family partake of the same human nature, *Adam* must have been considered as the federal head and representative of the human species, when this *law* was promulgated, or this *covenant* was established.

Not that the happiness of the species depended on the sole obedience of the man; nor, as the law extended to the woman, since she was formed out of the man, could the happiness of their children depend on the joint obedience of the parents; for the law extended to them also, because it was given to the human nature, which they must have received from their parents; and, therefore, the children would have been equally intitled to the free liberty of eating of *every* tree in the garden, not excepted in the law, and equally forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, on the same penalty, with their parents; and therefore the happiness of the children would intirely and absolutely have depended on their own personal obedience: and thus the tree in the midst of the garden would have been the test of the obedience of the children; and to each of them respectively, a *tree of life*, continued life, or immortality, on the condition of their continued obedience, as their death would have been the necessary consequence of their having personally eat of the forbidden fruit.

It is evident, therefore, that if *Adam* had continued innocent till after the birth of *Cain*, his innocence could not possibly have been of any service to his son; his righteousness could not possibly have been imputed to *Cain*, any more than his [*Adam's*] sin could have been reckoned to him, if he had fallen after the birth of *Cain*; *Cain* must have stood or fallen by his own personal obedience or disobedience to the one positive law. But *Adam* fell from his integrity, and as the sole reason of the law was for the trial of man's obedience, that reason ceasing by the sin of the parent, before any child could be thought of, the law was superseded, and, as I may say, abrogated by the Law-maker, when he drove out the man.

F

If

If then this law was abrogated before the increase of mankind, (for *Adam* did not know his wife till after he was sent forth from the garden) (1); and if sin is not imputed when there is no law (2); how comes it to pass, that "Because our first parents eat of the fruit of a tree, all their posterity so dearly pay for it to this day, and suffer the punishment of a sin committed some thousand years before they were born? (3)" The reason is very evident, from what has been said above. For if we had not descended from *Adam*, we could not have suffered for his sin; because if *Adam* had died on the day he transgressed the Divine Command, and God should have created another man of the same original clay of which *Adam* was formed, and we had derived our being from this second man; on this supposition, we might well complain, if we suffered the punishment of a sin committed by one to whom we stood in no relation, but that of a fellow intelligent being, of a similar nature with ourselves. But this is far from being our case: we suffer, because we have derived our being from *Adam*, and therefore are partakers of the same human nature with him; of that nature, which when the law was given, centred in him; was tried in him, and in him condemned to suffer all that was threatned (in case of his disobedience) not to the person alone, but to the nature of the offending man.

As there is a certain beautiful analogy between plants and animals, with respect to their original formation, there is the same in their subsequent production, according to the settled laws of generation, by which the generic nature, and the specific difference of each of them respectively, are for ever preserved separate from every other genus and species of plants, and of animals; and if the manner of

(1) Gen. iv. 1.

(2) Rom. v. 13.

(3) "Quod de fructu hujus arboris comederint primi parentes, plebuntur hodie omnes eorum posterit: atque pœnas luunt peccati, aliquot annorum millia antequam nati essent." *Burnet. Archæol. edit. 2. p. 379.*

their

their generation had been different, that is, if it had pleased the Creator to have established other laws of generation for either, or for both, their respective natures, as plants, or animals, would still have been as different as they are now. If mankind had been propagated as trees, the case would have been exactly the same, with respect to us, since we have all proceeded from one *stock*: for it is a contradiction in terms to say, That a tree bearing fruit (at the creation) *whose seed was in itself after its kind* (1), could from that seed produce fruit of a different kind: Can a fig-tree bear olive-berries? or a vine figs (2)? Equally absurd is it to imagine, that the first man could multiply his species, that is, be the father of men, not after his kind, not after his own likeness (3).

The natural effect, therefore, of the propagation of mankind from one original stock, must necessarily have been the production of men, of the same specific nature in every respect; or with the same essential properties, of which the first man, and the first woman were possessed, at the time when the established laws of generation first took place.

Now it was certainly the will of the Creator, that man, as a

(1) Gen. i. 11, 12.

(2) Jam. iii. 12.

(3) Since the work of creation was finished in six days, for on the seventh day God had ended his work which he had made; and had rested—from all his work which he had made; it is evident, that every thing that exists in the world was created within the compass of the first six days; and therefore, that all mankind were created on the sixth day, and were literally in *Adam* (for the woman was on that day taken out of him, bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh), and received their being with him, when God formed him of the dust of the ground, and fitted them for receiving the breath of life, whenever in the course of his providence they should appear in the world. And this is abundantly confirmed by the present improved knowledge of nature which will not suffer us to doubt, that the stamina of all the plants and animals that have been, or ever shall be in the world, were, *ab origine mundi*, formed by the Creator within the first plant and the first animal of each respective kind.

rational and intelligent being, should act according to his nature; that is, that he should conform himself to the dictates of right, or perfect reason, before he was subjected to any law properly so called: and if after the publication of the law concerning the *tree, of the choice of good and evil*, our first parents had remained innocent till after the birth of *Cain*, *Cain* must have been, by the necessity of nature, like his father, of the same specific nature, in every respect. In these circumstances it might with great justness have been said of him, Behold he was shapen in innocence, [in a state of innocence] and in purity [in a state of purity] did his mother conceive him: his reason and his will must have been perfect, as his father's were; and with respect to his body, if he should never have transgressed the Divine Command, life, continued life, or immortality, would have been the stipulated reward of his continued obedience. But as by eating the forbidden fruit, our first parents fell from their original purity and perfection, their reason became impaired, and their wills depraved, it was naturally impossible that *Cain* should not partake of their now-altered nature; it was naturally impossible that his reason should not be impaired, that his will should not be depraved; and, therefore, as we are all brethren, it may with the greatest justness and truth be said, of not only *Cain*, but of every son and daughter of *Adam*, Behold, they were shapen in iniquity, [in a state of iniquity] and in sin [a state of sin] did their mothers conceive them (1). And, for the same reason, as *Adam*, for his transgression was condemned to death, it was impossible that *Cain*, who derived his being from a mortal man (and in like manner the whole human race) should escape the same punishment, because it was threatned to the human nature, in the person of his father, when the human nature centred in him.

How the fruit of a tree could produce so great, so fatal a change in our first parents; how it could possibly destroy the perfection of

(1) Psal. li. 5.

their

their nature, by making them blind, vicious, and miserable, is more a question of impertinent curiosity, than a rational inquiry; and, if put by a friend to revelation, is founded intirely on his ignorance of the nature of the Fall. For the proper question here ought to be—How one single act of disobedience to the Divine Command should produce such dire effects? for if the tree had bore fruit, which in its own nature (abstracting from the command not to eat of it) had been good for food, yet as it was forbidden in so solemn a manner, this would have made no difference, either in the temptation, the crime, or the punishment: for if the man had been commanded, not only not to eat of it, but not to touch it, as by touching he might be tempted to eat; or if he had been commanded not to have approached it within any determinate distance, the temptation from the name of the tree would have been the same; and if he had fallen by a single act of touching, or approaching it within the limits forbidden, the crime would have been neither less nor greater than he was guilty of by eating of its fruit. In short, whatever the prohibition had been, if the same penalty had been annexed, his disobedience would have been productive of the same change in his perfect nature, and would have affected his posterity in the very same manner, as his eating of the forbidden fruit has done.

Thus far may we go in our reasoning on facts; for the account of the Fall is an history of facts; but further than this our blindness and ignorance of the nature of things forbid us to extend our inquiries. How, therefore, or in what manner, one single act of disobedience to the Divine Command, could produce such a change in the bodies, as well as in all the powers of the souls of our first parents; and how the pure and spotless souls of their children (for they must have come out of the hands of their Creator as spotless and pure as those of their first parents) should, by their union with organized bodies, derived from such parents, be necessarily subject-

ed

ed to the powerful influences of flesh and blood, and all the consequences of the crime of *Adam*, as if they had in their own persons offended. How, I say, these amazing effects could be produced, it is absolutely impossible for us to form the most faint conceptions, unless we were capable of understanding the nature of man; the constitution of the human mind, as well as the divine mechanism of its enlivened clay; and of knowing with precision in what manner the mind acts upon the body, and the body is re-acted upon by the mind.

But how inscrutable soever the nature of sin may be in its effects, on the constitution of our minds, and the organization of our bodies, the fact is notorious; the history of all nations, people, and tongues, and the experience of every son and daughter of *Adam*, bear witness to the universal depravity and corruption of the human nature.

C H A P. V.

Of the Old Serpent.

FROM the history of the creation of this system, and of the fall of man; and from references to both in other parts of the sacred books, it appears—that before the formation of our system there did exist intellectual and immaterial beings, endowed with powers and capacities, far superior to those of spirits united to flesh and blood.

And as we are assured by the same authority, that some of these intellectual and immaterial beings had *fallen* from, and others had *preserved*, the original purity and perfection of their nature; since we have not the least hint in any of the sacred pages, of any other creatures than those rebel angels, who had thrown off their allegiance to the Sovereign Lord of rational and intelligent creatures, may we not rationally presume, that before the apostacy of *Adam*, they were the only intellectual and immaterial beings in the universe, that were *miserable*? (1) And if they were the first objects of the

(1) This sentiment seems to be confirmed by a remarkable passage in the epistle to the *Hebrews*, chap. ii. 16. “For verily he [Jesus] took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” But in the original it is expressed in very emphatic terms, *Οὐ γὰρ ἄγγελοι ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, he verily took not hold of the angels, [to save them when they fell] but he took hold of the seed of Abraham, of man, when he had fallen. The method, indeed, of saving man, by laying hold of him when fallen, is justly pointed out by our translators in the terms taking on him the seed, *i. e.* the nature of the seed of Abraham.

Divine Displeasure, they must have been the first *evil beings* that ever existed in the universe.

As the CHIEF of these apostate spirits (for they are many) having a two-fold kingdom, is called in the sacred books, THE PRINCE OF DEVILS, Ἀρχὴν τῶν Δαιμονίων (1), and the PRINCE OF THIS WORLD, Ἀρχὴν τοῦ Κόσμου τούτου, there must have been some cogent reason, why mankind have been made acquainted with the names and character of a being, of whom, and of whose order, it was impossible for us to have known any thing, unless it had been revealed.

But as it hath pleased the Creator to discover to us such an *accursed* character, it must have been because of some early connexion this *Prince of Devils* had with our globe and its first inhabitants, whereby he acquired the title of THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD, and THE GOD OF THIS WORLD.

For very soon after man was created, and subjected to the moral government of his Maker, a *serpent*, a *real serpent*, is said by *Moses*, to have calumniated and accused God, to the mother of mankind, and thereby to have deceived her into the first act of disobedience to the Divine Command. But if it was a serpent, a real serpent that deceived the woman, it is impossible that he could have been a mere serpent, a dumb irrational animal; for how could he, with all the subtilty of the most sagacious beast of the field, without the use of language, speak to, and without the use of reason deceive, the woman? Both of these powers indeed he seemed, but only seemed to be possessed of; and therefore this deceiver must have been more, much more than a serpent.

(1) Δαίμονιον, it is true, according to the antients, signifies no more than a Deity, a Spirit, a Genius, Fortune; but in the sacred writings, in which alone this order of beings has been discovered to mankind, particularly in the New Testament, it signifies an *impure*, or *evil* and *malicious spirit* a devil.

The author, therefore, and adviser of this first act of disobedience in our world, must have been an evil being. Under what appearance, therefore, soever, he acted in this his opposition to the Son of God, by whom God made the worlds, he was, from that very opposition, called *Satan* : and from his calumniating and accusing God, as well as from his deceiving the woman (for διαβαλλειν, is also to *deceive*, decipere, fallere *suídas*) he acquired the name Διαβολος, Devil.

Now if there can be found, in the whole creation, any other being to whom these two characters could ever, with any propriety, be applied, that serpent of which *Moses* speaks was not the Devil and *Satan* ; but if these characters do in the most lively manner express the temper and behaviour of the worst of beings, then this adversary, this deceiver, was not a mere serpent, but an apostate spirit ; and if a spirit, to accomplish any fraudulent design against flesh and blood, he must necessarily have taken to himself some visible form : he chose, on account of his natural subtilty, the *Serpent*, as the most proper instrument of his fraudulent design ; and therefore, being an invisible agent, of powers sufficient to employ the organs of a natural serpent, to the introduction of sin and misery into the world, he must have appeared to the mother of mankind, under the mask of a real serpent.

Hence another of his most expressive names, or rather his *surname*, for it was superadded to those of the Devil and Satan, THE DRAGON, THAT OLD SERPENT, WHICH IS THE DEVIL AND SATAN (1).

The origin of evil (natural and moral) in our world has already been argued on the only principles, from which any rational con-

(1) Καὶ ἔκραται τὸν δράκοντα, τὸν ὄφιν τὸν ἀρχαῖον ὃς ἐστὶ Διαβολὸς ὃ Σάτανας—
Rev xx. 2.

clusion can be drawn: but evil existed before the formation of the solar system. The fountain of goodness cannot be unknown to any rational and intelligent creature: Whence then did *evil* flow? From whence could it possibly flow, but from an *evil* being? The purity, holiness, and spotless perfection of the Divine Being necessarily suppose an essential and eternal difference of good and evil: every creature, therefore, capable of moral government, every created free agent must have been made originally pure and holy, with sufficient powers to maintain and preserve that purity and holiness, by obedience, though liable to transgress, whenever he should be subjected to the moral government of the Sovereign Lord of rational and intelligent creatures.

The first apostate, therefore, from the original purity and perfection of his nature, of whatever rank in the scale of being, must, from and of himself, have chosen evil: for, by supposition, he was free to choose, or to refuse; and by hypothesis, he was the first that ever did choose evil; and therefore, there could have been none to tempt, or persuade him to that choice: for it is a contradiction to imagine, that a good being could tempt, or persuade any other being to choose evil.

Now by this first act of rebellion, he must, *ipso facto*, have renounced his allegiance, and have bid open defiance to the pure and holy Governor of rational and intelligent beings, whereby he would necessarily become an *adversary*, an *enemy* to God and goodness; and consequently the author of all the *EVIL*, *moral* and *natural*, that has ever existed in beings, of his own, or any other order, whom by his authority, example, or any other influence, he may have drawn over to his party.

That the angels fell before the *Mosaic* creation, we are assured in the sacred books: in them they are represented as being witnesses

to the creation: for when they saw whereupon the foundations of the earth were fastened, and who laid the corner stone thereof, all the morning stars sang together, and [even] *all the Sons of God*, (not all the angels) shouted for joy (1). The distinction, therefore, between these morning stars, these sons of God, and those angels, who were affected in a very different manner at this glorious sight, must have taken place before the creation of our system.

For, that some of these exalted beings kept not their first estate, is as plainly asserted in scripture (2), as that God created the heavens and the earth; and we are as plainly told by the same authority, that pride was the condemnation of the devil (3). Now this condemnation necessarily supposes the breach of some law; for with angels, even of the highest order, as well as with man, "where no law is, there can be no transgression (4); and where there is no transgression, there can be no condemnation."

It is true, we are no where told, that angels were put upon the trial of their obedience, as man was; yet as some of them have fallen, and others have approved themselves to their Maker, either there must have been some positive injunction, some positive law, promulgated to them before their obedience could have been rewarded, or their disobedience punished: or, perhaps, which seems to be the more probable supposition, they had, for ages, no other rule of action, than what was implanted in their angelic constitution, and flowed from their rational nature, which would teach them an absolute and unconditionate obedience to their Maker, in whatever he should require of them, since by the right of creation alone, he became their Sovereign Lord and King.

(1) Job xxxviii. 6, 7.

(2) 2 Pet. ii. 4. Jude, ver. 6.

(3) 1 Tim. iii. 6.

(4) Rom. iv. 15.

The difficulties that attend any inquiries of this nature, have drawn from a very masterly pen the following reflection—"It is idle to inquire, because it seems impossible to discover, what gave occasion to the revolt of the fallen angels (1)." But with the utmost deference to so great an authority, we think, that it is not impossible, but only seems so, from our inattention to what is plainly discovered to us on this very subject. For if pride was the condemnation of the *Devil*, may not his opposition to the *Son of God*, before the foundation of the world, lead us to the discovery of that law, that positive injunction, for the breach of which he was condemned? May we not rationally suppose, with the greatest poet, and the best commentator on the History of the Fall, that those remarkable words, in the Second Psalm, were originally addressed to the SON OF GOD, in the presence of surrounding angels?—"I WILL DECLARE THE DECREE, THOU ART MY SON; THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE—And in consequence of this solemn and irrevocable decree, WORSHIP HIM ALL YE GODS, was the law promulgated to the assembly of the gods?"

For before there were any kings of the earth, to set themselves, or rulers to take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed, the grand opposition had been begun in heaven: and therefore this decree may very reasonably be referred to a declaration made in the presence of thrones, dominions, principalities and powers in heavenly places; even the noblest and most exalted of the creatures of Him, who is the image of the invisible God (2): for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were made by Him, and for Him (3).

(1) Reflections on the Sources of Incredulity with regard to Religion, second edit. Edinburgh, 1750.

(2) Coloss. i. 15.

(3) Ver. 16.

Now if the Son of God be the head of all principality and power (1), he must have been appointed to this dignity by the Father; and if in consequence of this appointment, the above-mentioned law (which absolutely subjected the whole heavenly host to the government of their Head) was broken by their Chief; this Chief must have been the DEVIL, and [even] SATAN, the original author of evil, because he was the first, and, till he had seduced his angels to revolt, the only transgressor in the universe.

Here, then, was the beginning of that opposition to the Son of God in heavenly places, which appears naturally to flow from the breach of the fore-mentioned law. For SATAN, having the most exalted notions of his own self-sufficiency, and forgetting his necessary dependance on, and the high obligation he had to his Maker; who in honour and dignity had raised him above his fellows, and perhaps had given him powers and capacities superior to any of the arch-angelic order; when he found, that by an irrevocable decree, God had set his only begotten Son far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named even in heaven; for he must have been set above them all, when they were all commanded to worship him; when, I say, he found, that by this mortifying decree, and the consequent positive injunction, he had for ever lost his pre-eminence in heaven, proudly disdaining to bow the knee to, he determined with all his power and influence to oppose the Son of God in his works; and insolently to set up his throne in opposition to the throne of his Maker, in as many of the new-made worlds as he could bring under subjection to himself.

Cast out from heaven, where evil cannot dwell, we hear of him no more, till we find him in the garden of EDEN, concealed in the

(1) Coloss. ii. 10.

body, or actuating the powers of a natural SERPENT. There let us leave him, whilst we attempt to search out a probable reason for his fixing upon our earth, rather than any other planet in the system, for the scene of action in this his new character. *How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!*

Since, in the sacred books, this malevolent being is represented, *as going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it* (1); and *as a roaring lion, walking about, seeking whom he may devour* (2); may we not be indulged in imagining, that after the formation of our system, this worst of beings had visited every planet, in order to learn their state, and the terms, on which their several inhabitants held their respective possessions; (for they must all of them have been subjected to the moral government of our common Lord) but when he had in vain attempted to seduce the other planets from their allegiance to their Sovereign; and had learned, that the dominion of the earth was given to man, made in the image of God; made for immortality, and fitted with powers to fill up the vacant heavenly thrones of him and his rebellious associates; his rancorous hatred and malice against the Son of God, and his envy to creatures made after his likeness, fixed and determined him to rob them of their innocence, set up his throne on earth, and demand that homage and worship from man, which he had insolently refused to pay to the Son of God in Heaven.

Vain, foolish, and unthankful man does not scruple to arraign the conduct of the Sovereign Lord of the universe, for permitting the worst of beings to introduce confusion and deformity into this part of his creation, in which, as in all his other works, beauty and harmony could not but prevail, since he that made, pronounced them all very good. With equal reason might man complain, that

(1) Job i. 7.

(2) 1 Pet. v. 8.

God ever created any free agent; for unless he should deprive such a being of this freedom of action, which would render him incapable of moral government, or restrain it, it must have been always in his power to choose evil (1).

But the whole will appear worthy of Him who doth all things well, when we consider, that the voluntary apostacy of SATAN, and his seduction of the angels that fell with him; and the Fall of MAN, have opened two new and amazing scenes to the whole universe: for before, perhaps, infinite ages before the existence of evil, (those golden ages of eternity) the infinite power, wisdom, goodness, and truth, with the rewarding justice of the Divine Being, were the only subjects of the praise and adoration of intellectual creatures; but now, those very attributes of the Deity would appear with additional glory, when the first overt act of rebellion, even in the highest order of intelligences, would call forth the tremendous *punitive* justice of the offended Deity; and the unwilling, yet seduced creature, of lower degree, would become such an object of the Divine Goodness, as constitutes that before-unknown attribute, MERCY—OR GOODNESS TO THE MISERABLE (2).

To display the unsearchable riches of this distinguishing goodness of God to miserable man, in that amazing scheme of redemption by his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, is the express design of revelation.

(1) "Although the human will be free from external compulsion and internal necessity, yet it is liable to be determined often by sensible and intellectual affections." *Boling. Post. Works*, Vol. V. p. 108. Yet so inconsistent is his Lordship as to suppose, that God might have prevented the Fall by restraining this freedom. "The free will of man was so much regarded by God, that we are told, he suffered Adam to fall, and to involve all mankind in his guilt, rather than restrain it for a moment, for a moment would have saved us from original sin." *Id.* Vol. V. p. 85.

(2) See *Reflections on the Sources of Incredulity*, p. 81—87.

But

But because, according to this long-concerted scheme of restoring man to the favour of his offended Maker, the Son of God was to take upon him our nature, and die for us, and by his death destroy him that had the power of death [who alone had the power of procuring our death] that is the Devil; may we not very reasonably conclude, that of all the inhabitants of the innumerable worlds in the universe, man alone is the object of this glorious, yet much-abused attribute of the Deity?

C H A P. VI.

Of the Formation of the Woman.

THE remarkable change in the creating language of the Deity, when God was about to create man, has been taken notice of above; in consequence of which, *God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them*: this is manifestly a general proposition. But as the peculiar and distinguishing manner of the formation of the woman is a circumstance so closely connected with the History of the Fall, that the success of the temptation seems intirely to have depended on that single circumstance; it pleased the Creator to preface the account of the temptation by which the woman fell, with the particulars of the formation of the mother of mankind.

And here the finger of God is remarkably distinguished, in forming the last and most finished part of the creation. For as God had determined to make of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth (1); when on the sixth day *Adam* had given names to all the creatures, and there was not found a help meet for him (2); *The Lord God caused a deep sleep (3) to fall upon*

(1) Acts xvii. 26.

(2) Gen. ii. 20.

(3) As pain is incompatible with innocence, the reason for this deep sleep is evident.

Adam, and he slept: And he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made be a woman, and brought her unto the man. The literal account of this fact is confirmed by the reflection *Adam* was instructed to make, when with his waking eyes he saw (what, perhaps, in vision he had seen, under the forming hands of her Maker) a creature—not only in his own likeness, but of his own nature; for he said, *This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man* (1).

(1) Gen. ii. 21, 22, 23.

C H A P. VII.

Of the Fall.

GEN. iii. 1. *NOW the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made; and he said unto the woman,—*

Who this serpent was that spoke to the woman, has been minutely examined: what he said to her, in this conversation, with the effect of his reasoning on the woman, and of her consequent behaviour toward her husband, is the subject of our present inquiry.

And he said unto the woman, Yea, bath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

By this question it is most evident, that the serpent that proposed it, was perfectly acquainted with the terms on which the happiness or misery, the life or death, of our first parents did depend; it is very evident, therefore, that he knew the situation of the important tree; its designation, as a test of their obedience, with the promise of life, continued life, or immortality, in one of its names, and a peremptory threatening of death annexed to its other name, by which it was forbidden.

Now it was absolutely impossible that a serpent, even the Old Serpent himself, should have been acquainted with these particulars, unless they had been revealed to him by God; (which to suppose is

absurd;) or unless he had learned them from the mouth of *Adam* or *Eve*. But he was acquainted with these particulars, on which he founded his temptation, and therefore he must have acquired this knowledge either from the mouth of the woman, or of her husband. How easily this might have been effected, we shall attempt to shew.

It is natural to think, that when God had blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it to our first parents, inclination as well as duty would lead them to spend this first day after their creation, in solemn acts of worship; in the adoration of the wisdom and power of their Maker, discovered to them in the work of the six days; and in praise and thanksgiving for the profusion of his goodness to them, above the rest of the creatures, formed of the same earth with themselves.

But as all rational worship from an intelligent being necessarily flows from the relation such a being stands in to the Creator, as the Moral Governor of intelligent creatures; the first act of religious worship necessarily supposes, or rather consists in, an acknowledgement of that relation.

Now as God had discovered to *Adam*, (before the formation of the woman) the relation he stood in to Him, as his Creator; and when he promulged the law concerning the tree in the midst of the garden, he became his king and law-giver; it was necessary for *Adam* to instruct his wife in the knowledge of those relations, and the duties necessarily resulting from them, before she could join with him in any rational act of worship.

It is highly probable, that as *the tree of life*, even *the tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, was planted in the midst of the garden, it was there that the Lord God delivered the law to *Adam*;

Adam; and that he conducted *Eve* to the same remarkable spot of ground, to prepare her for the solemn service of the day.

Let us then suppose, that on this first sabbath, when this *son and daughter of God* came to present themselves before the Lord, SATAN came also among them to present himself, that is, to be present with them before the Lord; where only he could hope to learn the tenure by which they held the possession of this earth.

On this supposition, may we not very reasonably imagine, that when they were arrived at this place of worship, *Adam* opened the service of the day with the revelation he had received from his Maker, of the creation of the heavens and of the earth, even all the host of them; with an account of what had passed of his own knowledge, before she had any being but in his own person. Thus instructed, he might naturally address *Eve* in words to this purpose;

“ The Lord God formed me of the dust of the ground, and
“ breathed into my nostrils the breath of life, and I became a living
“ soul. And the Lord God took me and put me into this garden,
“ to dress it, and to keep it. Out of the ground in this garden
“ made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the
“ sight, and good for food: the tree of life also in the midst of the
“ garden, even the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And the
“ Lord God commanded me, saying, Of every tree of the garden
“ thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good
“ and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest
“ of it, thou shalt surely die.

“ After this solemn appointment, the Lord God caused a deep
“ sleep to fall upon me, and I slept; and he took one of my ribs,
“ and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib which the
“ Lord God had taken from me, made He thee, and brought thee

“ to me. And I said, this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of
“ my flesh: and I gave thee the name of woman, because thou
“ wast taken out of man.

“ Having thus made us male and female, God blessed us, and
“ God said unto us, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth,
“ and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and
“ over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth
“ upon the earth.

“ Such is the happy state in which we stand, and in which we
“ may for ever stand; for it is intirely in our own choice. Then
“ pointing to the tree—This is the tree on which our life or death
“ depends; in calling it the tree of LIFE, and forbidding our eat-
“ ing of it (as it is to be the test of our obedience) on pain of
“ death, God hath this day set before us life and good, and death
“ and evil. If we obey the Divine Command, the tree will be to
“ us a token, a pledge, a seal, of immortal life, as the sure reward
“ of our obedience; but if we transgress, Death, whatever may be
“ comprehended under that name, will be the inevitable conse-
“ quence of our guilt.

“ From *Eve* then turning, bowing, he adored——Maker
“ Omnipotent, till we shall know more of thy glorious works,
“ than one short day can teach us, how can our unexperienced
“ tongues proclaim thy greatness? But thy goodness inexpressible,
“ and condescension infinite to man, are plainly seen in this thy
“ tree of life: life to obedience hast thou thus annexed. With joy
“ we here accept the sacred tie, acknowledge Thee Creator, Sove-
“ reign Lord: great is thy bounty in the grant of every other tree,
“ nor will we dare to taste the fruit of thy forbidden tree.”

The serpent being thus fully informed of the particulars of their story, was furnished with materials sufficient, on which to form the plan of their ruin. And whoever considers with attention the words of the temptation, and the success of the tempter, will not think it unreasonable to suppose, that when *Adam* and his wife had finished their devotion, and had retired from the presence of the Lord, the serpent remaining before the tree, might break out into the following soliloquy (1):

“ Is this then the TREE, on which alone depends the life or
 “ death, the happiness or misery of these sons of clay, these earthy
 “ substitutes of my angelic, arch-angelic nature? Hail, holy tree!
 “ sacred to—the short-lived trial of these raw unexperienced things,
 “ that boast the image of the Son of God! What more could I
 “ have wished for, than such a test of their obedience? *The tree*
 “ *of life!* even *the tree of knowledge of good and evil!* Is this,
 “ then, the propriety of the two names to the one tree? If they
 “ eat not, they live; and (what is death to me) they live for ever:
 “ If they eat, they die, and are my companions in misery, as in
 “ rebellion: death then shall be their portion; the very name by
 “ which the wise Maker of the tree has forbid it, shall be their de-
 “ struction: For where should wisdom (2) grow, but on the tree
 “ of knowledge?”

When

(1) *Soliloquy* may, perhaps, be thought too poetical for a dissertation, but the author chose thus to lead the reader step by step, into the formation of the serpent's plan, that he might be the better enabled to judge of the power of the temptation.

(2) As this interpretation of the word knowledge was the principal occasion of the Fall, which brought destruction and death into the world; may not the words of *Job* be justly applied (if they do not allude) to this abuse of the name of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, by the serpent's suppressing the terms, good and evil; and making the word knowledge synonymous with wisdom, as if wisdom grew upon the boughs of a tree? “Whence then cometh wisdom? And where is the place of un-
 der-

When we consider the tempter thus informed, and thus prepared for the execution of his scheme, the abrupt speech which *Moses* puts into the serpent's mouth, has a peculiar beauty and propriety. *And he said unto the woman, Yea, [is it true] hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?* And from this question to the woman it is very evident, that the woman was now separated from her husband; for the whole conversation was between the serpent and the woman; and *Adam* was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was [first] in the transgression (1). By the way, if there is any reason in nature for St. *Peter's* calling the woman the weaker vessel (2), the serpent's penetration must have been very deep, in that he proposed his ensnaring question to the woman when alone; as if he had despaired of imposing on the superior understanding of *Adam*. But if their capacities were equal, from the peculiar manner of the formation of the woman, he rightly judged, that if he could but procure her fall, it would be next to impossible for *Adam* to stand.

derstanding?—Destruction and death say, *We have heard the fame thereof with our ears.* God understandeth the way thereof, and he knoweth the place thereof. For he looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven. To make the weight for the winds, he weigheth the waters by measure.—Then did he see it and declare it; he prepared it, yea, and searched it out. And unto man [to *Adam*] he said, Behold the fear of the Lord, that is WISDOM, and to depart from evil is UNDERSTANDING." *Job* xxviii. 20—28.

(1) 1 Tim. ii. 14.

(2) 1 Pet. iii. 7.

C H A P. VIII.

The Temptation.

Serpent. **H**ATH God, indeed, said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Is it possible that he who saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good, should insinuate to you, that he had planted in this garden any one tree whose fruit is not good?

Woman. We have, from our bountiful creator, free liberty granted us to eat of every tree of the garden, except one: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die: and death would be the just punishment of our disobedience to so reasonable a command, when every green herb upon the face of the whole earth, and the fruit of every tree in the garden, excepting this alone, is ours.

Serpent. The tree in the midst of the garden? Which of those trees? for there are many in, or near the midst of the garden. By what name did God forbid it, under so severe a penalty?

Woman. He called it the tree of knowledge of good and evil. *Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, said he, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die,*

Serpent. If that be the name of the tree, ye shall not surely die: for God formed your bodies of the dust of the ground, and appointed every other tree in the garden for food for your bodies; but as he breathed into your nostrils the breath of life, and ye became living souls, he planted this tree, this tree of wisdom and knowledge, to be food for your souls. You were made in the image of God, after his likeness; and the more you improve in wisdom and knowledge, the more will you resemble him. No: be assured that death will be so far from being the certain consequence of your eating, that God himself knows (and who should know the virtue of the tree, like him who made it the tree of knowledge?) that in the day you eat thereof, then, even instantaneously, your eyes, the eyes of your understanding will be opened; the wisdom and understanding of a God will be yours; for ye shall be as God, to know good and evil.

But if any doubt remains in your mind, concerning the truth of what I have said, let me appeal to your own wondering eyes and ears: you see me, as our common Creator made me, a *Serpent*, a mere beast of the field: but you hear me talking and reasoning as *Adam*: you are my witness, that by the Divine Favour, I was distinguished from the brute creation, and made wiser than any beast of the field, which the Lord God had made. We all, indeed, though in possession of this earth, before you or *Adam* saw this light, (such was our Maker's pleasure) were confined to the green herb alone for our support, whilst the fruit of *this*, and every other tree, were, (as I now find) reserved for you, as creatures of a nobler form. But by the superior wisdom granted me, I have found out the grand secret, why we, who from the beginning have been placed under the dominion of man, were condemned to eat of every herb of the field, viz. lest if we had been indulged in the eating of the fruit of the trees of the garden, we might, perhaps, in process of time, have eat of this tree of knowledge, and thereby have become as man in wisdom and knowledge.

If, therefore, the tree be good for food to me, it must be so to you : and its amazing effects on me, must make it a tree to be desired to make you wise ; for by the sole eating of it, I have procured to myself (agreeably to its most significant name) knowledge and wisdom of a nobler kind, than ever beast could arrive to ; and (without which, knowledge would be absolutely useless) speech, that great and distinguishing gift of God to man. It is he who at first taught you more than the beasts of the earth, and made you wiser than the fowls of heaven (1) : and it is he who has magnified his power, in communicating to the fruit of a tree such amazing virtue. Me it has made as man—you it will make as God.

By such an appearance of reasoning, supported by a pretended fact of so very extraordinary nature, the woman was beguiled, cheated into too bold a persuasion that *the tree was good for food* ; that it was indeed a tree of wisdom, *a tree to be desired to make one wise* : she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.

If, with the inimitable *Milton*, we take the matter in this view, and compare the several circumstances of this representation with the two original characters, we shall be able to form a better judgment of the power of the *tempter*, and the comparative weakness of the *tempted*, though in a state of innocence and perfection.

The SERPENT, though, in his own nature, as a beast of the field, a dumb and irrational animal, is introduced speaking with man's voice ; inquiring into the penal sanction of the Divine Command, and in order to take off its force, impudently giving the lie to the God of Truth, and with all the sophistry of a modern critic, commenting on the word of God, by perverting the use of language, and fixing a lying sense on the name of the forbidden tree.

(1) Job xxxv. 11.

The WOMAN, a rational and intelligent creature, mistress of language, well acquainted with the divine law, in the perfection of innocence, knowing no evil, nor fearing any in that happy state, is addressed by this serpent in the language with which she was created, without expressing either wonder or surprize at the speaking of a brute; and without any hesitation or reserve, she answers his question in nearly the terms of the prohibition; thereby acknowledging her duty to God, and her obligation to obedience.

Now what could have been expected from a person of this character, in this situation, unacquainted with any thing but truth, sincerity, and uprightness of heart? Must not she have been much more open to the powerful influence of hypocrisy, fraud, and deceit, than it is possible for any of the children of men to be? And if this was really the case, it will admit of a question, whether, if the woman had not been deceived, it would not have been a greater miracle, than the speaking of a serpent could possibly be? for to distinguish truth from falsehood is a very difficult thing, even to a man of an exalted understanding, and an honest heart, who knows that truth has many enemies in the world; but the difficulty was infinitely greater to a person, absolutely unacquainted with falsehood, and who does not appear to have had the least shadow of a reason to believe, that there was in nature any being who was an enemy to truth.

But you will say, that the woman must have known that God was truth itself, that he was the supreme truth; and therefore that any being who should contradict the most plain and express words of the God of truth, must have been an enemy to truth, and consequently her mortal enemy, who aimed at nothing less than her destruction; for he that could offer any thing, however specious, either in word or action, to persuade her that the tree was good for food, and that God would not be as good as his word in punishing the

the eaters with death; such a being, you will say, she must have suspected, at least, if not have known to have been a liar, even the father of a lie. All this is readily admitted, and therefore the woman was absolutely inexcusable before God; but before men, all the above circumstances plead for her; and perhaps they had no small weight with our compassionate God, in his determining to make this deceived woman the means of restoring the human nature to its original purity and perfection, by Him, who in due time took upon Himself that very nature, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, [of introducing death into the world] that is the Devil.

Thus fell the mother of the human race: the serpent beguiled her, and she did eat.

Though what has been said may possibly satisfy some few equal and impartial readers, who admit the inspiration of *Moses*; yet, as there are very many who condemn the whole History of the Fall, as a most ridiculous and incredible story, it is necessary to attempt, at least, to shew the weakness of such a charge.

The late Lord *Bolingbroke* mentions, with great contempt, “a divine, who, speaking of the conversation of the serpent with the first woman, and the other circumstances of the Fall (that he may avoid the explanations given by the *Rabbins* of this story, or that of *Philo*, a little less extravagant than the others, all which turned the whole into allegory) has the front to assert, that there is nothing incredible in this relation literally understood (1).”

Let me ask his lordship's admirers, where is the single circumstance in the whole relation, that they can say is incredible, except

(1) *Post. Works*, Vol. V. p. 345.

the speaking of a serpent? It is true, the speaking of a serpent "is contrary to the experience of mankind, and to the natural course of things (1);" be it so; but, with submission to his lordship, this very circumstance is very much in favour of *Moses*, since if *Moses* (as Lord *Bolingbroke* insinuates) contrived this fable, he might easily have prevented the objection: for if instead of a *serpent*, he had told the same story of a parrot, the speaking of a parrot, "is conformable to the experience of mankind, and to the natural course of things." But the speaking of a serpent, that has no organs of speech, or of a parrot that has, is entirely out of the present question; it is what was said to the first woman, and what she did in consequence of what was said to her, that demonstrate the literal truth of that serpent's speaking.

Let us suppose, for argument's sake, that Lord *Bolingbroke* had been the first man (on his own principles, "he would have been produced in full strength of body and mind (2);" and let us suppose that it had been his lot, to have been placed in the same circumstances as the first woman was; though with this trifling difference, that instead of a *serpent*, his favourite dog *Bounce* had put the same question to him, as the serpent of *Moses* put to *Eve*; sure I am that his lordship could not have given a more proper answer to the inquisitive dog, than the woman did to the serpent: but if *Bounce*, who "with respect to moral nature, had little to do beyond hearkening to the still whispers, the secret suggestions, and "the sudden influences of instinct (3);" if *Bounce*, I say, should have replied in the same insinuating and ensnaring language as the serpent did; and to assure his lordship of the truth of all he had said, should have boldly asserted, that by eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, he had procured to himself the power of speaking with man's voice, and the perfect knowledge of his language;

(1) *Boling.* Vol. V. p. 344.

(2) Vol. IV. p. 43.

(3) Vol. V. p. 95.

and that his natural sagacity was instantaneously improved into reason; even reason in perfection; What criterion could his lordship have had, whereby to judge of the truth or falshood of what he had both heard and seen? If being unacquainted with fraud, and a stranger to falshood, as he could have had no such criterion, there is all the reason in the world to believe, that "although the human will
" be free from external compulsion and internal necessity," yet "as
" it is liable to be determined by sensible and intellectual affections
" (1)," his lordship would have determined as the woman did, and would have put forth his eager hand, and have eat as she did.

The speaking of a serpent, then, can afford no shadow of a reason for the charge of incredibility; since, if I must repeat it, it is *what was said*, and not who said it; and *what the woman did* in consequence of *what was said* to her, that demonstrates the truth of the whole story.

(1) *Beling*. Vol. V. p. 109.

C H A P. IX.

Of the Fall of Adam.

WE have seen how the mother of mankind lost her innocence; the serpent beguiled her, and she did eat (1). Not so our general father: the temptation by which he fell from the dignity of his nature, and thereby completed the apostacy of our species, was of a very different nature. The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, (said *Adam*) she gave me of the tree, and I did eat (2): *Adam*, therefore, was not deceived (3). If he had been

(1) Gen. iii. 13.

(2) Ver. 12.

(3) If this needed confirmation, another inspired writer would put it out of all doubt. But he that will not hear *Moses*, will not scruple to contradict *St. Paul*. The words of *Moses* are—The man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat, Gen. iii. 12, 13. *St. Paul* says, the serpent beguiled *Eve* through his subtilty, 2 Cor. xi. 3. *Adam* was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression, 1 Tim. ii. 14. But Dr. *Shuckford* insists that *Adam* was deceived, though not before *Eve*. “The words spoken by the serpent were all the subtilty they knew of him: these took the imagination of *Eve* first: *Adam* was first formed, then *Eve*. But *Adam* was not deceived; the apostle means, *Adam* was not deceived first: here *Eve* took the pre-eminence, and by what she added to what the serpent said, led her husband to be deceived also. This I take to be the true meaning of what the scriptures declare to us upon this subject.” *Creation and Fall*, p. 166.

If the most plain and express terms that can possibly be made use of, cannot give us the sense of any writer, language must be useless. Dr. *Shuckford* in this, as in many other passages, in his *Creation and Fall of Man*, has given his readers too great reason

been deceived by the serpent, why is it not said, that the serpent said to *Adam*, or to the man and the woman, Yea, hath God said ye shall not eat? Why is it not said that *Adam* took of the fruit and did eat? Why, if he was deceived, did he not say to God as the woman did, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat? Why? But because the facts were quite otherwise. *Eve* was alone (1) when the serpent deceived her; and therefore the serpent could not speak to the man. *Adam* did not put forth his hand and take of the fruit; but if we can believe that he spake the plain truth to God when he

reason to retort on him a reflection of his own—"He has the misfortune not to hit "the least tittle of the meaning of the texts cited by him," p. 74. For the apostle in this passage, is manifestly speaking of the subjection that a woman ought to be in to her husband: *Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence, 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.* The very next words contain two powerful reasons for this injunction of his, *For Adam was first formed, then Eve.* In *Adam* the human nature centred before the formation of *Eve*; from him she derived her being; and she received that being to be a help meet for him: in priority of nature, this subordination was founded, and therefore it was fit and decent that she should be subject to him, of whom she was a part, bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh. But besides this natural, there was a judicial reason for this her subjection; FOR [BECAUSE] *Adam* was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression. And this last was the principal reason why she was condemned by her judge, to be subject to her husband: "*Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and [though] he shall rule over thee*" [with the utmost rigor].

(1) Dr. *Shuckford* ventures to say, "MOSES says, that she took of the fruit and "did eat, and gave also to her husband, WHO WAS WITH HER, and he did eat." [Gen. iii. 6. *Creation and Fall.*] Nothing can be more arbitrary and assuming, than thus to add to the words of *Moses*—to make him say, *Adam was with her when she eat.* Since there is not the least hint in the text, or in the whole context, to countenance such an assertion, it is a notorious begging of the thing in question, which is whether he was, or was not, with her, when she eat of the fruit. If any word is wanting to express the full sense of this text, it cannot be *who was*, but *when he was* with her—She took of the fruit and did eat, and gave also to her husband [when he was] with her, [when she had found him, or when he came to her] and he did eat.

was examined concerning the fact, it was this; The woman, said he, whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.

That this was the sole cause of *Adam's* Fall, is evident from the preamble to the sentence passed on him; *Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee not to eat.* The woman hearkened to the voice of the serpent, but the man to the voice of his wife; she gave him of the fruit, nor could he refuse it from her hand, which he considered as his own. She was fallen, and if the penalty was not immediately exacted of her, she could not possibly fall alone, but must inevitably involve her yet-innocent husband in the ruin and destruction she had brought upon herself.

Now that this was the temptation by which the ruin of the human nature was completed, will appear from a bare recital of the circumstances in which *Adam* found himself, the moment he discovered that his wife had eat of the forbidden fruit.

Man having been created in the image of God, was in every respect perfect, as his Creator designed him, except that he was alone, without a companion fit for him, till God, out of one of his ribs, had formed a woman, and brought her to him, and they became one flesh. If God had made a woman of the same dust of which man was formed, and had commanded them jointly, or separately, not to eat of the tree on pain of death, this would have made a wide difference between the circumstances of the man, on the supposition of this woman's personal disobedience to the Divine Command; he might have seen her lost, and yet have maintained his own integrity. But as it pleased the all-wise Creator to make the man first, and whilst the human nature centred in him, to command him, saying, *Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat,*

but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat thereof; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die: As it pleased the Creator, I say, after this engagement with the man, to form the woman in so very singular a manner, as *Moses* relates, whereby she became bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh; this was a circumstance of so tender a nature, that it seems impossible for *Adam* not to have begun to fall, the moment he found his wife was lost.

For though, in his own person he was innocent of the crime, of which she, who in the most literal sense was bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, was guilty, and therefore had not incurred the penalty of death; yet, as there was a law, prior to the positive injunction concerning the tree, wrought in his constitution, whereby he was bound, by the strongest obligations, to love and honour and obey his Creator above every created being, he could not be innocent of a most notorious breach of this first and greatest commandment, if he hesitated a moment, which to choose—his wife—or his God.

The thought of foolishness is sin; and if he should have once halted between these two opinions, he must have had greater strength of mind than the human nature can be possessed of, except in a state of sinless perfection, if the greatness of his affection to his wife had not determined his choice, rather to be a partaker of her guilt and her punishment, than to have her torn from him for ever by death.

For in this view of the case, how was it possible for *Adam* to bear up under such a change of circumstances? under the dreadful apprehension of the certain death of *her*, whose life and happiness were absolutely necessary to his enjoyment of that life, and to his partaking of that happiness which God had promised to him,

and to the human nature ; which, when the promise was made, centred in him, on condition of the continued obedience, not of *Adam* only, but (as the woman was now a partaker of the same nature) to the obedience of them both ? God had *made them male and female ; had blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth,—and have dominion over—every creature.* Now by the death of the woman, here would be, in his apprehension, a final period put to all the happiness he was already possessed of, or had in prospect : in the loss of her, he must have lost his all.

If it be said, that another help meet for him might have been formed, and he might have still been the happy father of mankind, and lord of this lower world : this second woman might have been of a similar nature, which entirely alters the case ; but she could not have been a partaker of the same nature with him, unless she likewise had been bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh : and on this supposition, however perfect *Adam* was, the remembrance of his loss could never have been obliterated ; and such a state of uneasiness as would necessarily attend the death of *Eve*, would have been inconsistent with a state of perfect and absolute innocence : I say perfect and absolute innocence, because all uneasiness is pain, and all pain is punishment : and therefore, unless the nature of a perfect and sinless human creature had been totally changed ; or unless God had caused as great a degree of insensibility in the mind, as he had in the body of *Adam*, when he took one of his ribs to form the woman, the loss of *her* must have been more pungently and lastingly felt, than that of his rib, if it had been taken out of him when he was awake. This pain, however, though inconsistent with a state of perfect and absolute innocence, before the promulgation of the positive law concerning the tree, was very consistent with the innocence of *Adam*, with respect to his not having tasted the forbidden fruit ; since, therefore, the irrecoverable loss of his wife must have given him

him pain, he must have been guilty of some crime, some moral offence, for which this pain was the punishment; and this crime was the loving of his wife more than his Creator. God had commanded him not to eat of the tree of the knowledge, the CHOICE, of good and evil; but instead of testifying his love to God, and his obedience to the Divine Command, by absolutely rejecting the offered fruit, when his wife gave him of the fruit, he did eat. He loved, he eat, he died.

Does it not, from what we have said, appear, that the Fall of Man was procured by a double temptation? In the first, the woman alone was concerned; and the second naturally flowed from the peculiar circumstances of Adam, when he discovered his wife was irrecoverably lost. She alone had the eyes of her understanding blinded by the false reasoning of the serpent; he fell with his eyes open.

I am sensible that great men are otherwise minded; but that should have little weight with those who form their judgment of the Fall from Moses. Nothing can be more unfair and disingenuous than to apply to our first parents jointly, what Moses expressly applies to the woman, separately from her husband. "Their desire," says Dr. Shuckford, "to be as, or like God in knowing, was the mistake that became our first parents ruin (1)." But the Doctor is not alone in this sentiment; the late Dr. Sherlock says (2), "Moses gives an account, how Adam, through disobedience and a vain ambition, fell from the dignity in which he was created, and entailed misery upon his descendants." And again, "Moses tells us that Adam was tempted to eat the forbidden fruit, upon the hopes the tempter gave him, that it would make him like to God, and increase him in knowledge, to know good and evil: he thought it such an advantageous proposal, that he caught at the opportunity, and eagerly embraced the offer."

(1) Creation and Fall, p. 79.

(2) Discourses, Vol. IV. p. 36.

As this sentiment of the separate temptation of *Adam* is taken from *Milton*, we cannot omit his masterly description of it.

————— Some curs'd fraud
Of enemy hath beguil'd thee, yet unknown,
And me with thee hath ruin'd, for with thee
Certain my resolution is to die.
How could I live without thee, how forego
Thy sweet converse, and love so dearly join'd,
To live again in these wild woods forlorn?
Should God create another *Eve*, and I
Another rib afford, yet loss of thee
Would never from my heart; no, no, I feel
The link of nature draw me: flesh of flesh,
Bone of my bone thou art, and from thy state
Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe. B. IX. 904.

————— I with thee have fix'd my lot,
Certain to undergo like doom; if death
Consort with thee, death is to me as life;
So forcible within my heart I feel
The bond of nature draw me to my own:
My own in thee, for what thou art is mine;
Our state cannot be sever'd, we are one,
One flesh; to lose thee were to lose myself. Id. V. 952.

But "all this," says Dr. *Stuckford*, "is *Milton's* imagination, "and not *Moses's* history (1)." "This is entirely the poet's fiction (2)." It is no wonder that a writer, who in his attempt to explain the History of the Fall, has contradicted *Moses*, in almost every circumstance of that great event, should treat the whole History of

(1) *Creation and Fall*, p. 164.

(2) *Ibid.*

the Fall as a poetical fiction. There are, indeed, many passages in this divine poem, that can be viewed in no other light than as poetical embellishments, and for which there is no foundation in *Moses*. On this subject of the separate temptation of *Adam*, are *Milton's* representing the forbidden fruit, as most delicious to the taste of *Eve*; her address to *Adam* after she had eat; his giving the fruit an intoxicating quality to them both; and ascribing to it the first conjugal inclinations, as if it inflamed them with lascivious desires; their mutual accusations, and passionate reproaches of each other. But notwithstanding these fictitious ornaments, which are to be considered as the most beautiful, though necessary appendages to the finest poem in the world; the true History of the Fall is preserved entire, almost in the very words of *Moses*; the different temptations are asserted in the strongest terms, and better explained and illustrated by the poet, than by the whole body of critics and commentators, Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern.

We shall conclude this article of the Temptation, with the words of Mr. *Addison*, in his notes on *Paradise Lost* (Spectat. No. 351.)

“ The ninth book—is raised upon that brief account in scripture,
 “ wherein we are told that the serpent was more subtle than any
 “ beast of the field, that he tempted the woman to eat of the for-
 “ bidden fruit, that she was overcome by this temptation, and that
 “ *Adam* followed her example. From these few particulars, *Milton*
 “ has formed one of the most entertaining fables that invention
 “ ever produced. He has disposed of these several circumstances
 “ among so many beautiful and natural fictions of his own, that his
 “ whole story looks only like a comment upon sacred writ; or ra-
 “ ther seems to be a full and complete relation of what the other is
 “ only an epitome.”

C H A P. X.

Of the Origin of Shame.

WHEN every other living creature continues in life, with no other covering than what the Creator gives them on their entrance into being, or furnishes them with at stated times, in all the variety of usefulness and beauty; that man alone should be distinguished from the brute creation, in this respect; that he alone should be ashamed to appear, even to his own species, in his natural cloathing of skin and flesh, is a difficulty that cannot be accounted for on any principle in nature, because all adventitious cloathing is unnatural by supposition.

Custom, indeed, has established it as a kind of law, to cover the human body; but the difficulty still remains, for what could introduce so unnatural a custom into the world? Is it not, then, a rational presumption, that what has continued it in every civilized country in the world, was the sole occasion of its introduction among men? And that is—SHAME. *And they were both naked, the man and his wife; and they were not ashamed (1).*

From this most concise description of the *state of innocence*, it is evident, that if the man and his wife had continued *innocent*, they would have continued naked, nor could they have been ashamed:

(4) Gen. ii. 25.

innocence and shame are incompatible, for shame is an uneasiness of mind (1), and all uneasiness is pain, and the primary notion of pain is punishment (2). If, therefore, our first parents had continued innocent, they must have continued free from that uneasiness of mind, which the passion of shame produces in persons that are naked; nor could they ever have been ashamed of their nakedness, till they should have lost their innocence.

Nor those mysterious parts were then conceal'd.

Then was not guilty shame, dishonest shame

Of nature's works—————

So pass'd they naked on, nor shun'd the sight

Of God or angel, for they thought no ill (3).

But as soon as the woman had taken of the fruit and had eat; and had given also to her husband with her, and he had eat, *the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.* It is evident, therefore, that the first and immediate consequence of the Fall was, a SENSE OF SHAME, and that this sense of shame was the immediate cause of *their sewing [joining] fig-leaves together, and making themselves aprons.*

For as God had created them male and female, had blessed them, and said unto them, *Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish [fill] the earth,* [with sons and daughters in your own image, after your own likeness] it was impossible for them not to have been confounded with shame, at the very sight of the distinguishing marks of their sex; when they found, that by eating of the tree forbidden, on pain of

(1) "Shame is an uneasiness of mind upon the thought of having done something which is indecent, or will lessen the esteem which others have for us." *Locke's Essay*, p. 97. Second edit.

(2) See *Moral System*, p. 6.

(3) *Milton*, B. IV.

death, if the penalty was to be exacted of them before they should have any child, they would have defeated as much as in them lay the designs of Providence towards themselves; or if they should be suffered to live, towards their posterity: since they would have forfeited all right to the blessing of being fruitful, and multiplying and replenishing the earth, unless it were with sons and daughters in their now-sinful image, and their own miserable likeness. The consciousness of this unhappy change would naturally prompt them, in the best manner they could, to conceal their nakedness, even from each others eyes, for they were now alone.

But they were not suffered long to remain alone, to bewail their wretched situation, or to reproach each other for the different parts they had acted in this tragical scene: shame, of a very different kind, awaited their guilty souls; for *they heard the voice* (1) [the sound of the feet] *of the Lord God, walking in the garden in the cool* (2) *of the day*, and [dreading to appear before their offended Creator] *Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.*

(1) By voice, the *Hebrews* understand any sound, noise, or voice; and as the word is the same in *2 Kings*, vi. 32. *Is not the sound of his master's feet behind him?* the sense is the same. In the language of *Shakespeare* it would be, They heard the steps of the Lord God walking in the garden.

——Thou sound and firm-set earth,

Hear not my steps, which way they walk. *Macbeth.*

From this passage, it is evident, that the Lord God appeared to our first parents in some visible shape, most probably the same in which he afterwards appeared to *Abraham*, Gen. xviii. And by the manner in which *Moses* introduces him as walking in the garden in the cool of the day, it seems as if it had been customary with the Creator to pay such friendly visits to our first parents, after they had finished the work of the day.

(2) As in the heat of the day signifies at noon, so in the cool [*Hebr.* in the wind] of the day, evidently means, *in the evening*. How ignorantly, therefore, and absurdly has Lord *Bolingbroke* accused *Moses* of introducing the Supreme Being as taking the cool air. Vol. IV. p. 263.

C H A P.

C H A P. XI.

The Examination of the Offenders.

Ver. 9. **A**ND the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, *Where art thou?* [Has the sound of my feet driven thee from the place where thou hast been accustomed to meet thy Maker and thy Friend with pleasure? Why wouldest thou hide thyself from me?]

Ver. 10. *And he said, I heard thy voice [the sound of thy feet] in the garden, and [as I did not dare to lift up mine eyes to behold thy face] I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself.*

Ver. 11. *And he said, [Because thou wast naked?] Who told thee that thou wast naked? [Thou never before wast afraid to see my face; though thou and thy wife were both naked, yet till now you were not at all ashamed: Why then art thou afraid to see my face?] Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?*

Ver. 12. *And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me [bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh] she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.*

Ver. 13. *And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done?* [What ruin and destruction hast thou brought upon thyself, as well as upon thy husband?] *And the woman said,* [By a false interpretation of the name of the tree of which thou didst command that we should not eat] *the serpent beguiled me,* [cheated me into a fond persuasion that it was a tree good for food, food for my mind, a tree to be desired to make me wise] *and I did eat.*

Divines have been very severe in charging our unhappy father and mother with a crime, of which they were absolutely innocent. It is the highest injustice to their character, and without the least foundation from the sacred text, to say, "*Adam* endeavoured to ex-
"tenuate his guilt, by charging it on the woman, whom God had
"given him. Then God applied to her, and she threw the
"guilt on the serpent (1). Thus *Adam* excuseth himself, and
"chargeth God foolishly with his sin (2). Hast thou eat of that
"fruit which I had forbidden thee? *That* woman, that very wo-
"man which I received from thy hands, she brought it me, and
"I did eat (3). God gave *Adam* a help meet for him, yet rather
"than want a defence altogether, he made the gift he received
from God, an excuse for his disobedience to him (4)."

These reflections are the more severe and unjust, as there is not the least shadow of an excuse in the answers, either of *Adam* or the woman. In the awful presence of their Maker and their Judge, and under the immediate apprehension of his exacting the penalty of the broken law, they both of them declare the truth, the whole

(1) *Hunt's Essay for explaining Scripture*, p. 28. (2) *Poole's Annotations*.

(3) "*Comeditin' ex istoc fructu quem tibi prohibueram? Illa, illa, quam mihi dedisti Fœmina, illa mihi attulit et comedi.*" *Burnet's Archæol. Sacra*, p. 381. edit. 2.

(4) *Maclaurin's Sermons*, p. 3.

truth, and nothing but the truth, by a frank and open confession of their guilt, with the different and peculiar circumstances that attended them respectively, previously to their eating of the forbidden fruit. To *excuse*, and to *accuse*, are very different things: the answer of *Adam* is no more than a bare confession of his own guilt, without laying the least blame on the *woman*; but the woman's answer is a formal accusation of the *serpent*, as the author and contriver of the Fall. And it deserves a peculiar remark—That the Lord God accepts this testimony of the deceived woman, and immediately proceeds to pass sentence on the accused serpent. And by the way, this single circumstance is a proof, that the serpent was present when the woman bore her testimony against him: and indeed it seemed necessary, that the *tempter* should receive sentence in the same personated character, in which he had acted; and, therefore, there is no doubt, but that in the sight of our first parents, he was arrested and detained under the visible form of *that* serpent, in which he had deceived the woman.

C H A P. XII.

*The Sentence passed on the different Parties concerned
in the Fall.**On the SERPENT.*

GEN. iii. 14. *AND the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.*

Ver. 15. *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*

Dr. Sherlock has very justly observed (1), "That if *Moses* has given us the real words of God, in pronouncing sentence on the tempter, there can be but little doubt, that the tempter appeared and acted as a serpent." Yet we cannot but differ from this learned writer, when he adds, "And the judgment passed upon the visible agent in this fraud, was a judgment upon the deceiver himself, whoever he was, and could no otherwise be understood at the time." For, from the words of God in this sentence, it appears, that the visible agent in this fraud, and the tempter, were

(1) Use and Intent of Prophecy, Dissert. II. p. 273.

two very different beings, because the sentence evidently consists of two very different parts, which are so distinctly pointed out, that what belongs to the visible agent, can by no means be applied to the tempter; nor is it possible, that what belongs to the tempter, can be applied to the visible agent. *Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life*, is the sentence pronounced on the visible agent in the fraud, and on him alone; and cannot possibly be applied to the tempter, because these words are evidently addressed to a beast of the field, that was from that time to go upon his belly, and to eat dust all the days of his life: neither of which could be addressed to the tempter; whereas the words which immediately follow—*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel*—are as evidently a sentence pronounced on the tempter, on the deceiver himself, whoever he was, but could not possibly belong to the visible agent, a mere natural serpent; because, though the natural serpent here condemned to go upon his belly, and eat dust, might bruise the heels of some of the sons of *Eve*, it was absolutely impossible that he should bruise the heel of that *seed* of the woman, who was to bruise the head of the tempter, after the revolution of some thousand years. The tempter, therefore, though he had appeared and acted as a serpent, was more than a mere natural serpent, and consequently the sentence pronounced on the tempter, was much more than a sentence pronounced on the visible agent.

That the Fall was procured by fraud, and that the whole brute creation was brought under a curse by man's transgression, is evident from the sentence pronounced on the visible agent. The woman had said—*The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.*

Ver. 14. *And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, [because thou hast beguiled the woman] thou art cursed above*

above all cattle, and above every beast of the field——For if this serpent was, for this fraud cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field, then all cattle and every beast of the field must have been cursed with this serpent, in consequence of the Fall of Man, under whose dominion they were subjected by the Creator; whereas if man had continued innocent, they would have continued blessed with him.

The particulars of this curse on the visible agent are very remarkable——*Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.* Words cannot more plainly express the certainty of any facts than these do the reality of the change, both of the form, and of the food of the visible agent. For if this serpent went always upon his belly, his food was always dust: but from the beginning his food was every green herb——*To every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat* (1).

This single circumstance, therefore, of his being condemned to eat dust, is a demonstration that the original form of *this* serpent was as different before the curse, as his food was (2). The change, therefore, of both the form and the food of this serpent, was manifestly inflicted on the visible agent, for the part he had acted in this tragedy as a natural serpent.

If

(1) Gen. i. 30.

(2) That some species of serpents might have gone upon their belly before this curse, we will not pretend to deny; but that all serpents were not formed to go upon the belly, is evident from the present existence of serpents that fly. Now as this serpent was doom'd to a prone posture, it is most probable that his original form was that of a flying serpent. “The sentence denounced on the serpent cannot seem so strange, if we consider how different his original form was from his present, and
“ that

If it be said, that a natural serpent is not a moral agent, and therefore could not be guilty of the breach of any law, and consequently was not a proper subject of punishment, let it be considered, that as there is a *law of instinct* by which the whole brute creation is governed, as well as a *law of nature* for moral agents, this was not a punishment inflicted on a moral, but on a natural agent, for having acted contrary to the law of his nature, as a beast of the field. This law was discovered to *Adam*, when God said, *Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat.* By this law, the whole brute creation was confined to the herb of the field for their food; whereas, besides every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, every tree yielding seed was appointed to, and reserved for, the sole use of man (1). Now this law of instinct, this rule of action, con-

“ that God probably intended the debasement of that once-glorious creature, not so much to express his indignation against the beast, as to make it a monument of man’s unhappy Fall, and as a testimony of his displeasure against sin. Nor could this be unjust, the mere instrument of an uncommon crime being detestable, and often destroyed by human laws; and this great change in the serpent, perhaps, not felt, at least not distinguished by him as a misfortune.” *Univ. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 129.

(1) It is a very just observation of Lord *Bolingbroke*, “ That the Author of Nature has given to his different creatures different natures, according to the different purposes for which they were designed in the scheme of his providence; and every one of these natures includes its own peculiar law, whether that of *instinct*, or that of *reason*.” Vol. III. p. 408.

The power of this law of instinct, is, by the same noble writer, admirably illustrated in Vol. IV. p. 33.

“ The bees co-operate visibly to one end, the general good of their respective communities; not by choice, nor compact, nor by authority neither; for their monarchs have no stings to punish the disobedient or the lazy; but by one invariable and constant direction, that of *INSTINCT*.”

M.

cerning:

cerning food, was broken by the visible agent, a mere natural serpent, when he had eat of the fruit (1), not of a common fruit-tree, but of the tree that was sacred to the trial of man's obedience: if, therefore, the Lord God did, for this fact, change the natural food of this serpent, for that which is so contrary to the established order of God, in his appointment of food to serpents as beasts of the field, such a change must have been a punishment inflicted on the visible agent in this fraud; for if instinct be a law, any change of the state for the worse in a creature subjected to that law, or rule of action, may with equal propriety be called a punishment, for the breach of such law, as the rule of action may be called a law. And by the way, if this serpent did break the law of his nature, as a beast of the field, here is another proof that the tempter, the deceiver, was much more than a mere natural serpent; for since the world began, it was never known that this law of instinct has been violated by any beast of the field, any fowl of the air, or any thing that creepeth upon the earth, except in this single instance.

But the most extraordinary circumstance of the curse on the visible agent is, that he was condemned to *eat dust*, and that, all the days of his life (2).

(1) That the serpent did actually eat (or appeared to the woman to eat) of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, is evident; for the woman could not have seen that the tree was good for food, unless she had seen the serpent (or believed she saw him) eat: and that he did eat in the presence of the woman, we shall make to appear in the sequel.

(2) Nothing can be more low, flat, and insipid, than what the critics say of this food of the serpent: "Dust, filthy and nasty food—not that he should eat nothing but dust; but because, as he went upon the ground, he could not but take dust into his mouth with every thing he should eat. *Pulverem, i. e. viles & immundos cibos—non quod vescatur solo pulvere; sed qui cum humi repat non potest quin pulverem in os cum aliis cibis simul ingerat.*" *Poli Synopsis.*

"Or, the dust is the serpent's sauce rather than his meat; whilst creeping and groveling upon the earth, and taking his food from thence, he must necessarily take in dust and filth together with it." *Pool's Annotat.*

In

In order to understand the connection between the breach of this law of instinct, and this part of the punishment of the serpent, it is necessary to inquire into the nature of the fruit, and consequently of the tree of which he eat.

“What particular tree this tree of knowledge was, has been matter of much conjecture: the vine, the apple, the common and *Indian* fig-tree, and wheat, though no tree, have all put in their claim; and though the generality are for the common fig-tree, yet what *Moses* has so industriously concealed, is above the power of any to discover (1).” But this question will appear extremely idle and vain, since it is founded on a supposition, that the tree of knowledge of good and evil was like other fruit-trees, which might have been eat (2), and therefore is absolutely inconsistent with what *Moses* has plainly discovered concerning the specific nature of fruit-trees that were good for food. The vine, the apple, the fig-tree, and every other fruit-tree that can be named, had their seed in themselves after their kind; and this being the *Mosaic* characteristic of trees good for food (3), they might have been freely eaten; but as the tree of the *knowledge of good and evil* was never designed to be tasted, but on the contrary, was forbidden, on pain of death, *it could not have any seed in itself*, and therefore its specific nature must have been very different from every other fruit-tree upon the earth; and consequently, its fruit must have been, like the tree, *a fruit, sui generis*.

Now as the serpent was the first that prophaned this once-sacred tree, sacred to the trial of man's obedience, by eating of its fruit, and as for this fact he was doomed to eat dust all the days of his life,

(1) Universal History, Vol. I. p. 130.

(2) “The tree prohibited was, I apprehend, like other trees of the garden, pleasant to the sight, and good for food.” Dr. *Shuckford* on the Creation and Fall.

(3) Gen. i. 29.

may we not be allowed to put the following question?—Does not the singular kind of this punishment discover to us the singular nature of the fruit of this famous tree? Though like other trees in the garden it was pleasant to the eyes——

“ Though its fruit, burnish'd with golden rind,

“ Hung amiable——

“ Yet in reality it was

“ ————— Like that which grew

“ Near that bituminous lake where *Sodom* flam'd (1).”

On such a supposition ; if such was the nature of the forbidden fruit, how must our general mother have been amazed and confounded with the most bitter shame and remorse, when, instead of regaling her sense with fruit of a most delicious taste, she found her mouth filled with worse than gravel (2)—with loathsome and abhorred DUST and ASHES?

There is certainly nothing unnatural in this supposition ; on the contrary, the connection between his violating the law of instinct, and the punishment of the visible agent, seems to confirm the justice and the propriety of the sentiment : for what could have been more equitable in the judge, than thus to suit the punishment to the crime? What closer connection could there have been between two natural actions, than between this serpent's eating of the fruit of a tree which was contrary to the law of his nature to eat, as a beast of the field, and his being doomed to eat no other food all the days of his life, except what was of the same specific nature with the fruit of which he had eaten?

Let us now consider that part of the sentence on the serpent that belongs to the deceiver himself, and which cannot be applied to the

(1) *Milton*, B. X.

(2) Bread of deceit is sweet to a man, but afterwards his mouth is filled with gravel. *Prov.* xx. 17.

visible agent—*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*

It has been proved above, that the words, *Thou shalt bruise his heel*, cannot possibly belong to a natural serpent then existing; because, though *that* serpent might bruise the heels of some of the sons of the woman, he could not possibly bruise the heel of *THAT SEED* of the woman, who was to bruise the head of this serpent: to which we may add, that the words, *It shall bruise thy head*, can never be applied to the *natural* serpent then present, because that serpent was to die—*Dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life*; and he must have been dead some thousand years before the seed of that woman appeared in the world: for at the flood, every living creature out of the ark was destroyed (1). The serpent, therefore, in this part of the sentence, must have been the invisible agent, *the deceiver himself*: and he is with the greatest propriety called a *serpent*, by an easy metaphor, from his having abused the organs of that creature, who was more subtle than any beast of the field that the Lord God had made, and had appeared to the woman as a mere natural serpent, and therefore he is with equal propriety condemned in the character of *that* serpent, to a punishment suited to the nature, not of a mere beast of the field, but of an intelligent being, to wit, to the total destruction of his power and usurped dominion over mankind, which was in due time to be accomplished by the *seed* of the woman.

If it be said, as “those who are for a literal sense urge, that the
“narration here is historical, and that we ought not to suppose a
“metaphor to run through the character of a person chiefly con-
“cerned; that however this may be admitted in the poetic and
“prophetic style, yet in the historical ’tis absurd: that the tempter

(1) Gen. vii.

“ is not only called a serpent, but treated as such: he is said to be
 “ *wiser* than the beasts of the field: he is doomed to *eat dust*; to
 “ creep upon his belly; and is described by a natural property of a
 “ serpent, *the biting men by the heels* (1).”

Let it therefore be observed, that, in this sentence on the serpent, the style beautifully varies with the character: the natural image is wholly preserved, and runs through the character of the visible agent, as a natural serpent, and this is in the *historical style*: but where the natural image ends, *the metaphorical style* begins: and as the style here is evidently prophetic (for the words professedly contain the *first* prophecy that was ever revealed to man) the metaphor runs through the character of the tempter, as an intelligent being, as a *metaphorical serpent*. The tempter, therefore, though he be called a serpent, *is not treated as such*: the visible agent is treated as such, as a natural serpent, as a beast of the field; but the tempter is treated as a metaphorical serpent, as the most subtle of malevolent beings, as the author of all the moral and natural evil in the world.

The great difference between the visible agent and the tempter, may be further argued from the difference of the times of the execution of the sentence on the natural, and on the metaphorical serpent: that on the visible agent was, no doubt, begun to be executed immediately, in the presence of our first parents: whereas, that on the tempter could not take place till the seed of the woman should appear in vengeance against him.

(1) Use and Intent of Prophecy, p. 266.

C H A P. XIII.

The SENTENCE on the WOMAN.

GEN. iii. 16. *UNTIL the woman be said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception. In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children.*

Nothing can be more evident from this part of the sentence, than that if the woman had continued in her original state of innocence, she could not have brought forth children in sorrow; for were it possible that this could have been the necessary consequence (as we are told it is) of her original make and formation (1), then this absurdity would follow—That the woman's sorrow in conception would have been greatly multiplied, and in sorrow would she have brought forth children, though she had not fallen; that is, she would have suffered the most excruciating pains (for all pain is punishment) before she had been guilty of the breach of any law.

But suppose, that instead of the pains of child-bearing, there should have been not only joy, when a man was born into the world, but a most sensible pleasure to the woman, even in the birth: on this supposition, would not this natural action have been the necessary consequence of her original make and formation? And would not the pleasure attending this natural action have been the necessary

(1) See Use and Intent of Prophecy, p. 272.

consequence of its being performed in a state of innocence? Sure I am, that the supposition not only involves no contradiction, but is perfectly consistent with every attribute of the Creator. For, in her original state of innocence and perfection of body and mind, *God had blessed the woman* jointly with her husband, in this very particular of the multiplication of their species, *when he said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply*—Now since God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good—every way fitted to answer his purposes in their original make and formation; can it be said, can it be thought, that if the woman had not forfeited this blessing by her disobedience, she would not have had as much pleasure in conception and child-bearing, as, when the blessing was forfeited, she was sensible of pain and sorrow? For if health, in the present condition of mankind, be justly said to be—That state of body and mind, in which we perform every natural action with ease and complacency, is it not most reasonable to conclude, that health, uninterrupted health, in the original condition of the human nature, may as justly be defined—Such a state of body and mind, in which every natural action must have been performed, not only with ease and complacency, but with such degrees of sensible pleasure, as the Creator had fitted the various organs of the human body to communicate? And who will say that God, who in the most consummate wisdom made all things, did not form every man and woman for happiness in every natural action, so long as they should continue worthy of that happiness, by a constant and uniform obedience to him, as the Sovereign Lord and Governor of the universe?

But this happiness was lost, and with it the woman's freedom and independency.

(Ver. 16. continued.) *And* [notwithstanding that in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children] *thy desire shall be to thy husband*, [whereby

by thy sorrows shall continually be multiplied, for thou shalt impatiently long for more: *Give me children*, thou shalt say, *or else I die:*] *And* [because thou hast usurped authority over thy husband] *he shall rule over thee.*

As there is not the least intimation in the words of *Moses*, of any superiority of the man over the woman in their state of innocence; and as, in the nature of things, there does not appear to be any foundation for such superiority; for the woman was made to be an help meet for the man; and being bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, she was of the same nature with him: without, therefore, any apparent difference, but of sex, (since they must have been mutually helpful, as well as mutually necessary to each other) this subjection of the woman to her husband must have been a punishment, and not the least part of the curse inflicted on her; and which, not a few of her daughters find, by woeful experience, to be more severe than the pains and perils of child-bearing.

Great is the propriety of these different parts of the sentence on the woman. It became the just Judge of all the earth to multiply her sorrow and conception, and to appoint that in sorrow she should bring forth children, who by this one act of disobedience, had entailed sorrow upon every one that should be born of a woman. And as she had taken upon her to determine, in a matter on which the happiness or misery of the human nature did eventually depend, without the advice or consent of him, from whom she had received that very nature, and thereby led him into inevitable ruin and destruction; it was fit and reasonable that she should never more usurp authority over her husband, but from that hour be, in the most express terms, subjected to him as her head, her lord, her sovereign, though he should treat her with the utmost severity.

C H A P. XIV.

The SENTENCE on the MAN.

Ver. 17. *AND unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife—*

The woman, therefore, must have made use of some very persuasive language to induce her husband to eat; and, by his own confession, he took of the fruit from her hands—*The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the fruit, and I did eat.*

His wife, therefore, was his only tempter; the serpent was out of the question. The temptation by which she fell, was no temptation to him: and had she not been formed out of him, bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, *Adam* might have stood firm and unshaken in his original integrity, when he saw her lost and undone: but as they were literally one flesh, the ties of nature being unspeakably stronger in *Adam*, than could possibly be in any other man that might have proceeded from him, though he should have been born in a state of innocence, he could not but choose rather to *die with*, than *live without*, her.

Cursed is the ground for thy sake—[that very ground, which for thy sake I had blessed, and caused to yield to thee its strength, in bringing forth every green herb, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed for the support of thy natural life, for thy

sake will I henceforth deprive of its exuberant fruitfulness,] *In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.* [And to increase thy labour and thy sorrow] *Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee,* [in abundance] *and thou shalt eat* [thy principal support shall be] *the herb of the field.* *In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*

Thus was death to make its approach by slow degrees, according to the letter of the penal sanction of the broken law—*Dying, thou shalt die.* For as life, continued life, or immortality, which in its comprehensive name includes every idea of happiness, depended upon, and was to be maintained by, the fruits of the ground; this curse on the ground, being a curse on the very means of life and happiness, must necessarily have been productive of every species of misery, till at last it should be completed in DEATH, that is, in the resolution of an animal body, formed of dust, into its first principles.

Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return, was indeed said only to *Adam*; yet as every other creature that liveth and moveth had the same original, and was to be supported in life by the fruits of the same ground, and, therefore, sooner or later, is resolved into dust; this curse on the ground extended not only to *Adam*, and every one that is born of a woman, but to the whole brute creation.

As the law was given to the human nature, for the human nature centred in *Adam*, when he received the command concerning the tree in the midst of the garden; so the sentence of death for the breach of that law was denounced against the human nature: but as the difference of sex constitutes a kind of *specific* nature, the different sorts of punishment denounced on the female and the male (the same may be said of the lower creation)

are to be considered as denounced on them and on their offspring, according to this their specific nature ; and accordingly we find, in fact, that not only every one that is born of a woman returns to dust, but that every man is heir to the particular punishment awarded to *Adam* ; and every woman is liable to, or actually inherits, the sorrows of conception, with the pains and perils of child-bearing, and is subjected to the absolute rule and government of her husband.

To conclude——If women had now no sorrow in conception and child-bearing ; if many of the sex were not actually subjected to the tyrannical behaviour of their cruel and inhuman husbands ; if man did not eat his bread in the sweat of his face ; and if the whole species did not universally return to their original dust, then the *Mosaic* account of the Fall would be no more than an idle tale, a ridiculous fable. But as the several particulars of the sentence passed on the parents of mankind, are the melancholy lot of every one that is born of a woman ; this universal *feeling* of our nature is such a demonstration of the literal truth of the History of the Fall, as must receive additional force from every birth and every death on our globe, till time, to us, shall be no more.

C H A P. XV.

An Appendix to Chap. III. Of the Tree of Life, &c.

GEN. iii. 20. *AND Adam, to express his faith in the Divine promise of a seed to bruise the head of the serpent, called his wife's name Eve, because she was eventually to be the mother of all living.*

Ver. 21. *Unto Adam also and to his wife, not only to guard their tender bodies from the now-inclement atmosphere, but to testify his approbation of their modesty, in having covered from each others eyes, those parts, of which they had now so much reason to be ashamed, did the Lord God make coats of skins, of the beasts they had offered in sacrifice, and cloathed them.*

Ver. 22. *And the Lord God said, Behold the man, created in the image of God, with every moral perfection, free to choose or to refuse, has been deceived in one of the names of the forbidden tree, and is become as one of us, to know the good which he has refused, and the evil which he has chosen: And now lest he should be deceived in the other name of the tree, and thereby be tempted to put forth his hand, and take also of the tree [as of a tree] of life and immortality, and eat once more of the still-forbidden fruit, and be persuaded that he shall live for ever, let him be turned out of the garden.*

Ver.

Ver. 23. *Therefore, lest if permitted to remain there, he should be tempted to eat of the tree of life and live for ever, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.*

Ver. 24. *So he drove out [sent forth] the man: And he placed at the east of Eden [at the entrance into the garden which was towards the East] cherubim, and [even] a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way, to guard the passage, of the tree of life.*

If we enquire into the foundation of the notion, *That the use of the tree of life was to render or preserve man immortal*, we shall be told, that it is manifestly founded on the words of God in this famous passage; but it is impossible that any words of God should give the least countenance to a notion, which though almost universally maintained, (till the Rev. Mr. [now] Dr. Kennicott attempted to prove the contrary) is directly contrary to the express penalty affixed to the command concerning the tree in the midst of the garden—*In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*; and to the more explicit declaration of the Judge—*In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return* (1).

But there is a previous question to be put, which will assist us in this inquiry. Whence came the notion that the tree of life (whatever that tree was) was ever designed to be tasted? If it was ever designed to have been tasted, it must have been good for food: if it was not good for food, not good to preserve life for any number of days, it was absolutely impossible that it could have preserved life for ever. But that the tree of life was not good for food, and consequently

(1) Gen. iii. 19.

that it was never designed, by him that planted it, to have been tasted, is abundantly demonstrated by *Moses*.

For, *Out of the ground* [in the garden] *made the Lord God to grow every tree that was pleasant to the sight, and good for food: the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, even the tree of knowledge of good and evil* (1). The tree of life, therefore, was not good for food, whether it was the same with the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or a very different tree (2).

The general grant to *Adam* for food, before he was put into the garden (besides every green herb) was *every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed*, Gen. i. 29. and was in fact the same as that in the garden—*Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat*—that is, of every tree that is good for food; or of every tree in the which is *the fruit of a tree yielding seed*; for that is the *Mosaic* characteristic of a tree good for food; and God could not have given the man free liberty to eat of any trees in the garden that were not good for food. In consequence of this distinction between trees *good*, and *not good* for food, as old as the creation, the tree in the

(1) Gen. ii. 9.

(2) Though it has in its proper place been demonstrated, that the tree of life was the same with the tree of knowledge of good and evil, yet for argument's sake, *let* it be a very different tree; even on this supposition, it was not good for food: for if there were two trees, they were as manifestly distinguished from every tree good for food, in the former clause of the verse, as if they were but two names for one, even the same tree. For since every other fruit-tree in the garden, and indeed upon the whole earth, was appointed for the support of man's life (for free liberty was given to the man to eat of every fruit-tree in the garden except one, and out of the garden no tree was excepted) there could be no possible need of any other tree to support man's life, which was already so amply provided for: but if from the *Mosaic* account of trees good, and not good for food, it can be proved that the tree of life was not good for food, such proof will abundantly confirm our other arguments for the unity of the tree in the midst of the garden, and consequently that it was never designed to be tasted, though it had not been forbidden on pain of death.

midst of the garden, the tree of life, *even* the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was *excepted* before it was forbidden.

Remarkable to this purpose is the account of the creation of the vegetable world (1), *Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself UPON THE EARTH.* Those words, UPON THE EARTH, manifestly distinguish the fruit-trees upon the whole earth, whether *in* or *out* of the garden, that were good for food.

Now as God had, out of the ground in the garden made to grow a fruit-tree, thus plainly distinguished from every other tree that was good for food, it must have had no *seed* in itself; (for as it was forbid to be touched, it could never have been known to have had no seed, but by its having been forbidden to be touched) and if it had no seed in itself, it must have been a tree *sui generis*; and because it was a tree *sui generis*, and therefore could not possibly bear fruit after its kind, it was absolutely unfit for food, and consequently it was absolutely impossible, that by eating of its fruit, man should live for ever.

Let me now ask, what possible reason could the Lord God have had for sending the man forth from the garden, to till the ground from whence he was taken? What reason, I say, could God (who is the supreme truth and reason) have for sending the man out of the garden, but to send him out of the way of the *tree of life*, lest the *serpent* should form a *second* temptation, founded on that name of the tree, as he had formed the *first*, on its other name?

Though this appears to us to be the true reason of the expulsion of our first parents, yet to throw what light we can upon this darkened subject, give me leave to exhibit, in one view, the prin-

(1) Gen. i. 12.

ciples, or the ground on which this peculiar sentiment of a *second* temptation is founded.

For, though the dominion of the whole earth was originally given to *Adam*, he was not left to his liberty to choose where to lead his happy life; but, for the trial of his obedience, God placed him in a garden, and there he entered into a covenant with him. The token of this covenant was the *tree* in the midst of the garden; the condition on God's part, was, the *promise of life*, continued life or immortality, in one of its names; the condition on the part of man, was, obedience to the one command, not to eat of the tree *by its other name, on pain of death*. If, therefore, man had continued innocent, *life*, continued life or immortality, would have been granted him, as the stipulated reward of his continued obedience; but if he should disobey the Divine command, if he should once eat of the tree of which God had commanded that he should not eat, he was to forfeit all right, which otherwise he would have had, to continued life or immortality; or, in the words of the covenant—In the day he should eat thereof, he should certainly die.

Let us now suppose, that after man had broke this covenant, and after the sentence was passed on the several parties concerned in the Fall; since the tempter was threatned with the total loss of his power and authority from the *seed* of the woman, and the death of our first parents was put off, at least till the woman should have a son; if the man had been permitted to remain in the garden, what could have been expected as the natural consequence of his continuance in the neighbourhood of the *tree of life*? The tempter well knew, that though the man and his wife had eat of the forbidden tree, and yet continued to live, its fruit was still as much forbidden, as before it was tasted; and therefore, that the penalty of death still remained annexed to the eating thereof, for the law was not re-

pealed, nor could be made void, but by destroying the tree, or removing the man and his wife out of the garden.

Now in these circumstances, what can be more natural than to conclude, that since the woman was made a party against the disappointed and enraged serpent, to procure her death by a second transgression before she could have a seed, would be the grand point he now would have in view? But as he *knew* of no possible means of accomplishing this design, unless he could prevail upon the credulous woman to put forth her hand once more to take of the tree, as of a *tree of life*, he insolently determined on a second temptation, not doubting but he should succeed in *this* as he had done in the *first*, from this single presumption, that she who had been so easily cheated into the belief of one absurdity—that the eating of a tree forbidden by God, under the name of the *tree* of the knowledge of good and evil, would make *her* as God, to *know* good and evil, would as easily be cheated into the belief of another, if possible, a greater absurdity—that eating of the same tree forbidden, under the name of the *tree of life*, would make her as God in *living for ever*. *Skin for skin, all that a man hath, will he give for his life*, was a proverb afterwards made use of by *Satan*, the Old Serpent, in the case of *Job* (1); and perhaps it was on this very maxim that he formed the plan of this *second* temptation, rightly judging, that she who was now absolutely condemned to death, would readily give up her reason, and all her hopes of immortality from the promised seed, for the sake of the present life.

But the merciful Lord God knowing the weakness of fallen man, and foreseeing that as the serpent had procured the Fall of the woman, by uniting the ideas of eating and knowledge, in one of the names of the forbidden tree, he would unite the ideas of eating of

(1) Chap. ii. 4.

the same tree and living for ever, in the other name of the tree, *the tree of life* (1), in hopes of making the promise of a Saviour void, by procuring a second apostacy: foreseeing, I say, this consequence of man's remaining near the tree of life, *ver. 23. therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden* (2).

(1) Critics and commentators would do well to consider to whom they are indebted for the notion of eating of the tree of life, and in consequence of eating thereof, of the eaters living for ever. For none but the father of lies could ever have insinuated that the tree of life was so called, because it would make the eaters immortal; whereas by the most solemn appointment of God (who made it, and called it the tree of life) life and immortality were as closely connected with, and intirely depended upon man's not eating, as death was closely connected with, and intirely depended upon, his eating the fatal fruit.

(2) Since the Fall of Man may justly be called an *HISTORICAL DRAMA*, for it is a very lively representation of one of the most signal actions that ever was performed by persons, illustrious in their different characters, real and assumed, and which had a most fatal issue; some further light may be thrown on this speech of the Lord God—*Behold, the man is become as one of us*—from the nature of the epilogue in dramatic poetry, which is a speech addressed to the audience when the action was over, by one of the principal dramatis personæ, containing some reflections on certain incidents in the *drama*, particularly those of the part of the person that speaks it.

The incidents in this *tragic drama* are singularly striking. The manner in which the reflections on those incidents is conveyed to the audience by the principal persona, is most sublime, worthy the majesty of the Divine Speaker. The double plot, founded on the two names of the tree, is discovered; the one to procure the Fall of Man, the other, if possible, to vacate his redemption. The fatal success of the *first* is expressed, even in the words of the temptation; the second is unravelled by the reason given by the speaker for sending the man forth from the garden; and by the manner of securing the road to the tree of life, from his, or the serpent's, ever returning to the garden.

But lest an illustration from such a species of writing should be thought unbecoming the sacred subject, let it be observed, that if it be just and proper, it will be easy and natural, and then it is not material from what species of writing the illustration is borrowed; and let it be remembered, that “the first hint of *Paradise Lost* is said to have been taken from an *Italian* tragedy; and it is certain that he [*Milton*] first designed it a tragedy himself; and there are several plans of it in the form of a tragedy, still to be seen in the author's own manuscript, preserved in the library of *Trinity-College, Cambridge*.” *Dr. Newton's Life of Milton*.

Thus did the super-abundant mercy of God prevent him with the blessings of goodness, in leading him out of the temptation, and thereby securing him and his posterity a prospect of life and immortality, through faith, in the promised Redeemer.

So he drove out the man : And he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and [even] a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of [to guard the passage to] the tree of life.

For as the angels of God, by whatever name distinguished, *cherubim* or *seraphim*, are his ministers to do his pleasure; and the *cherubim* were appointed to this service; it was necessary that they should appear to the offenders in some visible shape; for which reason it is highly probable, that they had orders constantly to appear before the entrance of the garden in their UNIFORM OF FIRE and FLAME, the more effectually to deter the man and his wife, with every human creature, from attempting too near an approach to the now-forbidden garden.

To this angelic guard the author of the 104th *Psalms* seems plainly to allude, when in that truly sublime and magnificently-beautiful description of the power and providence of God, he says—*Who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flame of fire.*

C H A P. XVI.

Of the Origin of Sacrifices.

THE great obscurity of the first prophecy concerning the *seed of the woman*, has been, and will continue to be, objected to the religion of *Jesus*, because his religion is entirely founded on that prophecy. But the objection will appear to have lost all its weight, when we separate that which is obvious and plain to the several parties immediately concerned, from what was not to be understood by either of them; nor indeed could possibly be, by the most exalted created intelligence, unless the Divine Being should, by an additional revelation, or in the course of his providence, communicate the secret to him.

The prophecy is contained in the sentence passed on the serpent—*I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: IT SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD, AND THOU SHALT BRUISE HIS HEEL* (1).

There is no doubt but the serpent, before this sentence was passed on himself, was in hourly expectation of the full accomplishment of his wishes, in the death of our first parents, whilst they could not be a moment free from the dread of the execution of the Divine threatening—*In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die* (2): but

(1) Gen. iii. 15.

(2) Ibid. ii. 17.

by this declaration of the Lord God, all his hopes were disappointed, and their fears were, for the present, removed.

Now, by the very first clause of this sentence, both the parties had the greatest and most perfect assurance which the God of Truth could give them, that a lasting enmity should from that moment subsist between *the serpent* and *the woman*, and between *his seed* and *her seed*; and consequently that the woman, at least, should not die, till she should have conceived, and have brought forth a child; and as it is most probable that the *woman* had the highest expectation of a Saviour in the person of *this child*, it is as probable that the serpent ran as early into the same mistake, and concluded that *this child* was to be the person, the *seed* that was to bruise his head. By the latter clause, both parties might indeed plainly understand, that the child spoken of would be to the *one* an unspeakable blessing; to the *other*, a most heavy curse: but who this extraordinary person was to be, when he should appear in the world, and how he was to bruise the serpent's head, were not only at this time, but for ages continued to be, impenetrable secrets.

Where is the objection now? In this view, the beauty of the promise of a Saviour is seen in the obscurity, the designed obscurity of the prophecy in which it is contained. For those ever-memorable words were not uttered to, though in the hearing of, our first parents, but to their mortal enemy the *serpent*: they were the awful sentence of the Lord God, when he entered into judgment with the first offenders on this globe. And by the way, that the *serpent* was the first of the criminals on whom sentence was passed, and the only one of them who was condemned, without a single question being put to him by the Judge concerning what he had done, is a strong presumption that he was more than a mere serpent, that he had been an old and a hardened offender.

The

The prophecy, therefore, is to be considered in a *double* respect; with regard to the *serpent*, as a *threatning*, a *severe threatning*—That one should be born of the woman whom he had deceived, who should destroy the usurped power and dominion of the *evil one*: to our *first parents*, as a promise of a victorious conqueror, who should repair the breaches of the Fall, and restore man to the favour of the offended Deity; and, at the same time, accomplish these grand designs, by means that would confound the serpent and all his seed.

And here it is worthy of a peculiar remark, that the serpent; who impudently promised the woman, that upon her eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, she would become as God in knowledge, was himself as *ignorant* of the meaning of this part of the sentence passed on him, and as much deceived in his notion of her seed, as the woman herself was. *O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out (1)!* This is that mystery (2)

(1) Rom. xi. 33.

(2) Whether the word *mystery*, as it is thus explained and applied to this first discovery of the method of salvation by JESUS CHRIST, which, since his appearance is now no longer a *secret*, be a proper subject for *ridicule*, let reason judge. But reason cannot judge, when reason itself is poisoned with passion. “The only poison to reason,” says Lord Shaftsbury, “is passion. For false reasoning is soon redressed, where passion is removed. But if the very hearing certain propositions of philosophy be sufficient to move our passions, ’tis plain the *poison* has already gained on us, and we are effectually prevented in the use of our reasoning faculty.” *Characteristicks*, Vol. i. p. 91.

Let us apply the noble author’s words to propositions in divinity (for the rule is as infallible in one science as in the other): If the hearing of certain propositions of divinity, in which the word *mystery* is one of the terms, was sufficient to move his lordship’s passion, his lordship was effectually prevented in the use of his reasoning faculty: and how necessary the understanding the several terms of a proposition in any science is, to the placing any of them in a ludicrous light, let his lordship’s admirers judge. Of the beauty and propriety of this and the like expressions, see *Mosaic Theory of the Solar and Planetary System*, p. 27.

which was kept secret since the world began (1); which hath been hid from ages and generations, but now is made manifest (2).

But to return; though the promise of a seed was sufficient for the then-present purposes of raising the drooping spirits of our first parents, who stood naked and trembling before their Judge, and of preparing them to receive their own milder sentence; yet it was no more than a foundation for their faith and hope in the mercy of God, it was no rule of duty. A particular revelation, therefore, was as necessary after their *Fall*, as after their *Creation*. For if in a state of *innocence* God gave them a law, or command, as the only test of their obedience, or the only rule of their duty, it is inconsistent with all our notions of the goodness of God to imagine, that he left them without a *new* command, a *new* law, such a one as would be suited to their *now-fallen* state; one that would direct them what they were now to do, in order to procure the blessings promised in this seed of the woman.

The *moral law* was, at his creation, implanted in the nature of man; and as that was a *perfect rule* of action to creatures made in *moral perfection*, it could not possibly receive any alteration in its nature or obligation by the fall of such creatures. If on the day of her transgression the woman had died, and the man had not sinned, this law would still have been as holy, just, and good, and as binding to *Adam*, as before the woman's apostacy; and when they had both fallen, and were both spared for a second trial of their obedience, the law was still the same, and every son and daughter of *Adam* must have been equally bound by that law, because they would necessarily be partakers of the same human nature.

Now since, in the state of innocence, the only terms or conditions of *life*, and of *death*, were the *not eating*, or the *eating* of the

(1) Rom. xvi. 25.

(2) Coloss. i. 26.

tree in the midst of the garden ; (for the *promise of life* was manifestly contained in one of the names of that tree, on the express condition of our parents *not eating*) and death was the penalty annexed to the other name of the same tree, on the sole condition of their eating of its fruit. And since not only the sentence of death was not executed on the transgressors, but a Deliverer was promised them ; other terms of life, other conditions of obedience must have been proposed to them as *sinners*, which, if complied with, might reconcile them to the favour of their Maker, and entitle them to that *life and immortality*, which they had forfeited by the Fall.

These terms, therefore, these new conditions of obedience, must have been discovered to our first parents by some express law, by some positive institution. The historian, it is true, makes no mention of any such law ; nor was it all necessary, that either the institution itself, or the time when it was appointed, should have been particularly specified, because the very first acts of religious worship recorded by *Moses*, viz. the offerings of *Abel* and *Cain*, do plainly and necessarily suppose such an institution.

For, if any kind of sacrifices were offered in these early times, and the Lord God testified his approbation of, and accepted that sacrifice, this approbation or acceptance is a demonstration, that he himself had appointed both the matter and the manner of such sacrifice ; otherwise he would not have testified his approbation and acceptance of it (1). And if at, or about the same time, and in the same place, an offering of another kind was brought to his altar, which the Lord God refused to accept, it is equally

(1) Most probably by fire from heaven : this was afterwards the usual token of God's acceptance of sacrifices, *Lev. ix. 24. Judges vi. 21. 1 Kings xviii. 38. 1 Chron. xxi. 26. 2 Chron. vii. 1.* However, there must have been some *visible sign*, because *Cain* was a witness to, and founded his resentment on, the distinguishing appearance.

demonstrable that he had, previously to these acts of religious worship, instituted some religious rites of the sacrificial kind; otherwise he would not have rejected such offering (1).

Now since there is no intimation of any one thing relating to sacrifice, previous to these offerings of *Abel* and *Cain*, except *coats of skins*; and since God accepted the offering of *Abel*, which was of the firstlings of his flock, and consequently must have been killed and flayed before they were laid upon the altar, we have (though not a demonstration) the strongest presumption, that God appointed this kind of worship in the garden of *Eden*; for it was there the Lord God made to *Adam* and to his wife, *coats of skins*, and clothed them (2), before he drove out the man. And here I cannot forbear to remark, that if sacrifices were appointed in *Eden*, that appointment will appear to be a strong additional proof of the justness of our interpretation

(1) When the law of sacrifice was given at Mount *Sinai*, every particular in that various service was most minutely specified; and in consequence of that law, every sacrifice, or every offering, performed according to the *Mosaic* ritual, was accepted, *Lev.* i. 4. xxii. 21, 27. xxiii. 11. otherwise it was not accepted, *Lev.* vii. 18. xix. 7. xxii. 23, 25.

If, therefore, the offerings of *Cain* and *Abel* were respectively of the same kind, with those appointed in the *Levitical* law, there can be no reasonable doubt but they had the same original: and if they had the same original, we may very reasonably conclude, that as the law of the burnt-offering, and of the trespass-offering, of the meat-offering, and of the sin-offering, was the law which the Lord commanded *Moses* in Mount *Sinai*, in the day that he commanded the children of *Israel* to offer their oblations unto the Lord, *Lev.* vii. 37. so the law, the original law of burnt-offering and meat-offering, according to which *Abel* and *Cain* brought their several oblations, was a law which the Lord commanded *Adam* in the garden of *Eden*, in the day that he commanded him to offer his oblations to the Lord.

(2) The peculiar favour God shewed them in cloathing their now-naked and defenceless bodies with the skins of their sacrifices, was in its own nature a further proof of his acceptance of them and their offerings. And the consummation of their marriage, soon after their expulsion from the garden, consequent upon their having been thus graciously accepted, makes it still more probable, that the first sacrifices were offered

terpretation of *Gen.* iii. 22. or, (for they seem to depend on each other) if our interpretation be admitted, it will in the highest degree be probable, that sacrifices were instituted in *Eden*: for nothing could have more exasperated the enraged serpent; nothing could have more enflamed him with thoughts of dire revenge on the woman, than the appointment of such religious rites formed on the plan of our redemption, during her continuance in the garden.

Thus early was the first part of the sentence fulfilled in the enmity between the serpent and the woman. And we shall soon see that of *his* seed and *her* seed literally verified in the following History of *Cain* and *Abel*; which, perhaps, may afford us some considerable light in this important business of sacrifice.

offered in *Eden*. And as the time of the evening sacrifice, after the giving of the law, was peculiarly honoured with special appearances of favourable answers to the prayers of some great and good men, *1 Kings* xviii. 29, 36. *Dan.* ix. 21. and those sacrifices were thought most acceptable to God, *Psal.* cxli. 2; is it not reasonable to conclude, that those first sacrifices were offered on the first evening after the Fall? For it was in the cool of the day, in the evening, when these particulars were transacted.

C H A P. XVII.

The History of CAIN and ABEL.

GEN. iv. 1. **A**FTER his expulsion from EDEN, *Adam knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord. [Heb.] A Man, the Lord.*

Ver. 2. *And she again bare his brother Abel: And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.*

Ver. 3. *And in process of time, it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering to the Lord.*

Ver. 4. *And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and [even] of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering.*

Ver. 5. *But unto Cain, and to his offering, he had not respect: And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.*

Ver. 6. *And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? And why is thy countenance fallen?*

Ver. 7. *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And [even] unto thee shall be his desire; and thou shalt rule over him.*

There

There is a certain peculiarity in the writings of *Moses*, which alone (abstracting from any consideration of his being inspired) may be looked upon as the great characteristic, that distinguishes him from every other writer of ancient history: and it is this—That notwithstanding the extreme conciseness of his history, from that of the creation, to his account of the division of the earth, there is in almost every period, some one passage at least, which is a *key* to some interesting part of the narration.

Of this kind is the account of the birth of *Cain*—*She bare CAIN, and said, I HAVE GOTTEN A MAN, THE LORD*; which opens a new scene of things, or rather discovers to us the *plot*, or story of the first tragedy that was ever acted upon our stage.

The promise of a *seed* contained in the sentence passed on the serpent, must have produced in the mind of *Eve* so great a change, from the fear and dread of immediate death, to the most sanguine hopes of a restoration to the favour of God, by this promised seed, that her joy at the birth of a son may well be imagined to have been great, in proportion to the greatness of the blessing she had in view. Is it possible, that in these circumstances *Eve* should make use of so low, so jejune, so unaffecting a speech, as *Moses* has put into her mouth—*I have gotten a man from the Lord*? whereas, if we read the words according to the original (1), *I have gotten a Man, the Lord*; and attend to the name given to him by his mother (which signifies *possession*) we have the strongest presumption, that the true reason of her giving him this remarkable, this significant name, was, the full persuasion she had, that by the birth of this child, she was now put into the actual POSSESSION of what God had promised—the seed that was to bruise the head of the serpent.

(1) $\Gamma\Lambda$ Novies repetitur hæc particula in eodem hoc, & antecedente & sequente versiculo; ubi octies significat indubitato articulum accusativi constructa. *Polis. Synops.*

Now if *Eve* was thus fully persuaded in her own mind, that *Cain* was this promised seed, it is natural to suppose that a fond mother would, (as soon as ever he was capable of understanding it) instil the favourite notion into his tender mind: This would naturally grow up with him into a fixed principle, that he was born heir of the promise, that he was to be this victorious Saviour: for the prejudices and prepossessions of our youth, especially when they are in favour of power and grandeur, are, perhaps, the most difficult to be removed. Is it any wonder then, that *Cain* brought only of the *fruit of the ground* an offering to the Lord, instead of joining with it a lamb or a kid—to be slain in the faith of the seed promised? For the fixed and unalterable persuasion that he was this *promised seed*, would for ever have been an insuperable obstacle to his bringing any thing to the altar of God, except the fruit of the ground, as a token of his gratitude to God for a blessing on his tillage.

If *Cain*, I say, believed that himself was the deliverer promised, how could he offer any sacrifice in faith of another?

Let this interpretation, and the reasoning naturally resulting from it, be, for the present, admitted; the proof of both the one and the other will, perhaps, appear from the following verses:

Ver. 2. *And she again bare his brother Abel.*

How old *Cain* was at the birth of his brother, *Moses* does not say; but we may very reasonably suppose, that he was grown up to man's estate; and that by an unhappy temper, and an irreligious behaviour, he had abundantly convinced his mother of her great mistake, in having *vainly* imagined her first-born to be the seed promised.

mised. To recognize, therefore, the vanity of such her fond imagination, she named this son ABEL, or *Vanity* (1).

Ver. 3. *And in process of time, it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering to the Lord.*

Ver. 4. *And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and*

(1) It is true, *Moses* does not say that *Eve* called this son *Abel*; but as she manifestly gave names to *Cain* and to *Seth*, expressive of her sentiments at their respective births; and as the word *Abel* agrees so well with what we take to have been the true reason of the name, we may well conclude, that it was his mother who gave him the name, since it is so expressive of her different sentiments of *Cain*, at the birth of this his brother.

It may not be improper in this place to remark—That such is the surprizing connection between the several parts of this short history, and their dependance upon one another so exact, that the name of her second son confirms the reason *Eve* gives for that of her first-born: and the name of her third is likewise a confirmation of the reasons assigned for the names of his two brothers: for at his birth, she expressed the same kind of joy, as she had done at the birth of *Cain*, which is a proof that she had taken *Cain* to have been the seed promised, when she said, *God hath appointed* [put, set, or placed] *me another* [not another son, but] *SEED, instead of ABEL, whom Cain slew.*

Let us take the whole in one view. At the birth of her first-born, firmly believing that in him she was possessed of the promised seed, *Eve* gave him the name *Cain, Possession*: for it was she that said—I have gotten, I am possessed, of a man, the Lord: convinced of her mistake, and confessing the vanity of her expectations from him, when she bare the second son, she called his name *Abel, Vanity*: but when she had seen (by the preference which the Lord God had given to *Abel* and his offering, and the consequent murder committed by *Cain*) part of the prophecy fulfilled in the enmity of *Cain* against his brother; she must have considered *Cain* as the seed of the serpent, and consequently have concluded (though here also she was mistaken) that *Abel* was this seed of the woman, this promised deliverer; and, therefore, when she bare another son, firmly believing the promise, she gives him the name of *Seth, put, or placed* in the room of *Abel*, which is a demonstration that she had not only taken *Cain* for the heir of the promise, but that she had changed her opinion of him, when she thought *Abel* had the better title.

[even]

[even] (1) of the fat [the best] thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering (2).

Ver. 5. But unto Cain, and to his offering, he had not respect: And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.

Cain, until now, had pleased himself with the thoughts of his being the *promised seed*; but as soon as ever he saw the respect which the Lord God had shewn to *Abel*, and to his offering, he looked upon this distinguishing mark of the Divine favour, as a demonstration, that all his proud and aspiring thoughts were vain: and thence concluded, that his brother was the person chosen by God to be this promised deliverer.

(1) The *Vau*, which is here translated *and*, is manifestly *exegetical* or *explanatory* of the quality of *Abel's* offering; for *fat*, in the Hebrew idiom, signifies the finest, the choicest, the best of every thing. "All the *fat* of the oil, and all the fat of the wine, and of the *wheat*," Numb. xviii. 12. *Psal.* lxxxi. 16. cxlviii. 14. So here, the *fat* [not of the firstlings] but of his flock, the choicest of all his flock.

(2) Let us compare the offerings of *Cain* and *Abel*, with those that were afterwards appointed by God in the *Levitical* law. "The meat-offering was to be of *fine flour*, Lev. ii. 1. or of the first fruits, ver. 12. or of green ears of corn dried by the fire, even corn beaten out of full ears, ver. 14.

If his offering be of the flocks of the *sheep*, or of the *goats*, for a *burnt sacrifice*, he shall bring it a male, without blemish, i. 10.

Now *Cain's* offering was of the first sort, and *Abel's* corresponds with the second; for it was of the firstlings of his flock [*Heb.* sheep or goats] and of the fat [the best] thereof; and the best must have been without blemish. Since, therefore, *Abel's* offering was of the same kind with what was prescribed in the *Levitical* law of burnt-offering, it is natural to conclude, that the manner of performing the rites prescribed by *Moses*, was the same that *Abel* practised upon this occasion. And if *Abel's* offering, and his only, was accepted, it was accepted to make an atonement for him: *Cain*, we may presume, was as well instructed in these matters by the precept and example of his father, as *Abel* was; but the reason of his very different practice we have already been acquainted with.

Ver.

Ver. 6. *And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen?*

Ver. 7. *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And [even] unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.*

The merciful and forbearing Lord God knowing the pride of Cain's heart, and the rancorous and malicious intentions of his enraged mind, does, in the mildest and most tender manner, expostulate with him, concerning the unreasonableness of his resentment; and at the same time endeavours to convince him of his error, by telling him that the true reason why he had no respect to him, or to his offering, was, because his offering was not a bloody sacrifice, in faith of the seed promised, as that of his brother was.

Why art thou wroth? Why is thy countenance fallen? Why art thou so enraged against thy brother, as thy countenance does so plainly discover? It is true I have accepted him, because of his faith in the promised seed: this he has testified to me by his offering a bloody sacrifice, as well as the fruit of the ground.

If thou doest well (1), shalt thou [also] not be accepted? as well as thy brother? If thou hadst brought to my altar, not only of the fruit

(1) *If thou doest well*—These words manifestly refer, not to the good actions of Cain in general, but to this one particular act of bringing such an offering to the Lord as Abel had brought; for of that, and that alone, does the Lord speak; otherwise, *If thou doest not well*, would be equivalent to—If thou art a sinner, a wicked man; which can bear no tolerable sense, when connected with the words that immediately follow—*sin lieth at the door*. Whereas, if the doing well refers to this single act, of bringing such an offering as God had appointed, which alone could have been accepted by him, the not doing well must necessarily mean, his not bringing such an offering.

Q

But

fruit of the ground, but an offering of the same kind with thy brother's, a memorial of the seed promised, I should have accepted thee and thy offering, as I have accepted thy brother and his offering; for there is no respect of persons with me; and *if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door*; [thy sin, in not joining to thy oblation of the fruit of the ground a bloody sacrifice, in memorial of the promised seed, is the true cause of my not having respect to thee,

But the true reason why neither *Cain* nor his offering were accepted, when he brought only of the fruit of the ground, is strongly asserted, and beautifully expressed by the metaphorical phrase—*SIN LIETH AT THE DOOR*.

For these words (how variously soever they have been distorted beside the intent of the Divine writer, and wrested by the whole body of critics) do plainly and evidently signify, that *sin* was the only cause of *Cain's* non-acceptance: that his not bringing a proper sacrifice was the *SIN* which lay at the door, stood in the way of, or obstructed his acceptance with the Lord. The phrase is not uncommon with the best writers, even at this day. When a person would express his having been the occasion, or the accidental cause of another's not having done a particular action; he will say, *that lies at my door*—I was the accidental cause of preventing the doing of that particular action.

“At the door of any one. Imputable; chargeable upon him. In any of which parts, if I have failed, the fault lies at my door.” *Johnson*.

“The real sin or guilt of causing schisms and divisions, *lies* always at the door of him who departs from the truth, and who lays the fires of religion where Christ has not laid it.” *Clarke's Sermon*. Vol. III. p. 320.

“The master, far from charging any of his family with the fault (of sowing tares) *lays it at another door*, an enemy hath done this.” *Sherlock's Discourses*, Vol. III. p. 195. But this learned writer seems to have forgot the true use of the phrase, when he interprets this very passage—*If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou dost not well, sin lieth at thy door*, i. e. “If thou art righteous, thy righteousness shall save thee; if thou art not, by what expiation is thy sin purged? It lieth still at thy door.” *Use and Intent of Prophecy*, p. 75.

But with great submission, the words of *Moses* are not—*sin lieth at thy door*, but *sin lieth at the door*. Here, by the way, we may observe the very early use of metaphors, and in particular the original of this manner of expressing the imputation of an action, in itself criminal, to the true author of such action.

nor to thy offering (1); yet, notwithstanding the respect I have shewn him, by accepting him and his offering, as the right of the first-born is thine] *even* to him shall be thy desire (2), and thou shalt rule over him.

But *Cain's* pride being thus greatly disappointed, this mild and gentle exhortation did but increase his resentment, and determined him to wreak all his rage on his hated brother, by killing him.

Ver. 8. *And* [in consequence of this bloody resolution] *Cain*

(1) Πίστις πλείονα θυσίαν Ἀβὲλ παρὰ Καὶν προσήνεγκε τῷ Θεῷ. "By faith *Abel* offered a more ample sacrifice than *Cain*; *Cain* had offered only inanimate gifts, *Abel* probably had offered these also, for these often accompanied the burnt-offering: but *Abel's* θυσία was something *over* and *besides* these, it was the mactation of an animal: and in not having this added, *Cain* came short of what ought to have been done by him." *Shuckford's* Preface to the Creation, p. 104.

But to do justice to the Rev. Dr. *Kennicott*, as he was the first modern writer who attributed to *Abel* a double oblation, not only of an animal sacrifice peculiar to himself, but of the fruit of the ground, in common with his brother, he appears to be the best expositor of the apostle's πλείονα θυσίαν.

(2) *To thee shall be his desire*—But the true meaning of this passage is to be learned from 1 *Sam.* ix. 20. When the children of *Israel* wanted a king to be set over them, and *Saul* was appointed to that office by God himself, *Samuel* said to him, "On whom is all the desire of *Israel*? Is it not on thee, and all thy father's house?" Now though the dominion of all the earth was given to *Adam*, it was not in *Adam's* power to constitute his eldest son lord of the whole earth; yet, by this declaration to *Cain*, it seems as if God had appointed him to some superiority over *Abel* and the rest of his children. For as before the appointment of *Saul* to the kingdom of *Israel*, he had no right to that high office, so unless *Cain* had been designed by God to this superiority over his brethren (for by nature they were all equal) he would have had no right to such superiority; does it not from hence seem probable, that by the original constitution of kingly government, the office became hereditary, only by Divine appointment?

By the right of the first-born, therefore, we would be understood to mean, that right which God had granted to *Cain*, in his own person, to rule over his brethren after their father's death.

talked (1) with Abel his brother : And it came to pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother, and slew him.

Ver. 9. *And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother ? And he said, I know not : Am I my brother's keeper ?*

When *Adam* was asked where he was, and what he had done, his answers were humble, modest, and literally true ; but the impudence and insolence of this reply could not have been exceeded by the father of lies, so exactly did the son resemble the *Old Serpent* in every feature.

Ver. 10. *And he said, What hast thou done ? The voice of thy brother's blood [the blood of him whose offering I have preferred to thine] crieth unto me from the ground (2).*

(1) As talking, in the scriptural style signifies friendly conversation, [*And he left off talking with him*, Gen. xvii. 22. *He kissed all his brethren and wept upon them, and after that he talked with them*, xlv. 15. *And the Lord talked with Moses*, Exod. xxxiii. 9, Luke ix. 30.] it is most probable, that under a shew of friendship *Cain* concealed his resentment from his brother ; and by his familiar conversation with him whilst they were taking a walk together in the field, he gained the more favourable opportunity of executing his bloody purpose.

But though *Cain* had such friendly conversation with his brother, it was not till after *Cain* had proposed to him to go into the field ; for the true version of these words is—“*And Cain said to Abel his brother, let us go into the field : And it came to pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother, and slew him.*” This short speech of the insidious *Cain* is preserved uniformly in the *Samar.* text, in the *Greek*, *Syr.* and *Latin* versions, and also in the *Targum* of *Jerusalem* and *Jonatban*, though not in the *Chald.* Paraphrase, which is the *Targum* of *Onkelas*. Dr. *Kennicott's* Dissertation on the Hebrew text, p. 350.

(2) If the voice of *Abel's* blood cried unto God from the ground, then *whose sheddeth man's blood, by-man shall his blood be shed*, was a law of nature ; and therefore, it must have been from the beginning of universal obligation, though it was not published till after the Flood, Gen. ix. 6.

Ver.

Ver. 11. *And now thou art cursed* [in a double respect; from the earth, and from every man that liveth upon it] *from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy band. For,*

Ver. 12. *When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength:* [And as thou hast forfeited all right to the society of men, by doing the work of the serpent, thou art cursed from every man that liveth upon the earth, who shall refuse all association with thee, and avoid thee, as they flee the hated serpent:] *A fugitive* [therefore] *and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.* [In this part of thy sentence, thou shalt be thy own executioner; thou shalt banish thyself from the face of every son of Adam].

Ver. 13. *And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear.*

Ver. 14. *Behold, thou hast* [by this severe sentence] *driven me out this day from the face of the earth: And from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond upon the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me* [whom the world will look upon as a mortal enemy to the human race, by having murdered him, whom I now too late believe was the promised seed] *shall slay me.*

Ver. 15. *And the Lord said unto him,* therefore [since thou complaineest of the sentence I have pronounced against thee, though it is not equal to thy horrid crime; and art afraid lest every one that findeth thee should kill thee, for thy greater punishment, no man shall dare to slay thee, for] *whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.* [For as I have put enmity between the serpent and the woman, and between
his

his seed and her seed ; because by thy temper and behaviour thou hast proved thyself to be the seed of the serpent, that enmity shall subsist between thy person and the seed of the woman : and I will take care to prevent any man from avenging the death of thy brother.] *And* [that every son and daughter of *Adam* might know, and be assured that he was the seed of the serpent] *the Lord set a mark* [impressed the figure of a SERPENT, or the name SERPENT] *upon* [the forehead, or the right hand of] *CAIN*, [the original of the mark of the beast alluded to by St. *John*] *lest any finding him, should kill him.*

Ver. 16. *And Cain* [in consequence of this peculiar judicial stigma, as soon as ever it was discovered to him] *went out* [banished himself] *from the presence of the Lord*, [the place where the Lord was worshipped] *and dwelt in the land of Nod, in the East of Eden.*

C H A P. XVIII.

A Digression on the Mark set upon Cain.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

AS the enmity between the serpent and the woman was a threatening, prior to that between his seed and her seed, it is natural to imagine, that in order to avert the curse impending over his head from her seed, his rage would begin to shew itself against the woman, before she could conceive and bear a child.

The serpent, as we have seen (1), presumed himself sufficiently cunning to escape the Divine vengeance, and elude the punishment awarded him in the sentence by a second temptation, to be founded on the other name of the tree—the *tree of life*, in hopes of procuring the death of the woman by a second transgression, before she could possibly have any seed: but this scheme was rendered abortive almost as soon as it was conceived, by that *philanthropy*, that love to mankind, which God manifested to us, in turning our first parents out of the garden. However, as his rage and malice were, no doubt, heightened by this second disappointment, since he could not procure the death of the *mother*, the destruction of the child, which in due time was to be born, would now be the principal point he would have in view. To this purpose, we have a most remarkable passage in the prophetic writings of St. *John* (2).

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman—And she being with child, cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.

(1) See Appendix to the Tree of Life, p. 96.

(2) Rev. xii.

And

And there appeared another wonder in heaven, and behold a great red dragon—And the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child, as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: And her child was caught up to God, and [even] to his throne.

The reader will be not a little surprized at the liberty we may seem to have taken with these words of *St. John*, as if we had taken a professedly mysterious prophecy for a narration, or history of things past: no, we readily admit that this vision was prophetic of the dreadful persecutions which were coming upon the church, represented under the figure of *a woman*, and her mortal enemy under the character of *a great dragon* or *serpent*. The particular interpretation of the prophecy, we leave to the divines; but if in this prophetic representation there should be found any references or allusions to some historical facts, how mysterious soever, or how various its interpretation may be, they must confirm such facts, in proportion to the justness and propriety of those references and allusions.

Let me, therefore, ask——Whence were these well-known images taken, if not from the History of the Fall, and the judgment passed upon the *serpent* and the woman?

Here is a *woman* with child, near the time of her delivery: and *a great dragon* or *serpent* standing before her (not to hurt the woman's person, but) ready to devour her child as soon as it should be born.

This *dragon*, therefore, in the *prophetic*, can be no other than the *serpent*, in the *historic* style. In the *one*, he is called the *great dragon*, and interpreted the *Devil* and *Satan*, which deceiveth the

whole world: in the *other*, he is called the *serpent*, who, in fact, deceived the mother of all nations.

The historic *serpent* was, in the first prophecy, threatened with destruction from the seed of the woman. This woman was, in due time, with child; cried, travailing in birth, and was pained to be delivered of *Cain*.

Thus far the history of *Moses*, and the prophecy of St. *John*, answer to each other literally; for though crying, travailing in birth, &c. are not mentioned in the story of the birth of *Cain*, yet they were necessary consequences of the curse denounced against the woman.

Now since the dragon of St. *John* is represented as waiting for the birth of the man-child, to devour it as soon as it should be born; and since the destruction of the serpent of *Moses* could not by him [the serpent] be prevented, by any more likely means than by destroying the child, of which the woman in *Moses* was ready to be delivered, and which he must (as well as *Eve*) have looked upon as the seed who was to bruise the head of the serpent: since, I say, these parts of the vision correspond so exactly with the circumstances in the history which we have mentioned, is it not most reasonable to conclude, that this remarkable particular in the vision concerning the dragon's design upon the man-child, as soon as it should be born, is as strong and as lively an allusion to the serpent's design upon the life of the child, of which *Eve* was ready to be delivered, as the other particulars are to the literal story of the occasion and consequences of the enmity between the serpent in the garden of *Eden*, and the woman that was to be the mother of a man-child, who, in the fulness of time, was to rule all nations with a rod of iron.

It will, however, be said, that the parallel cannot hold between the man-child in the vision, and the first-born of *Eve*, because he was not the seed of the woman that was promised; he was not the man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and therefore, the allusion is not a just one: but the parallel we insist on, is that between the man-child in St. *John*, and the true seed of the woman, who was afterwards described in much the same language, as in *Psal.* ii. 8, 9. *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.*

The deceiver of the woman was himself deceived, in imagining that the first child *Eve* should bear, was to be the seed promised: since, therefore, he was so egregiously mistaken in the person of the child that was to be born, his attempt, or design upon the life of this child, may very justly be said to be alluded to by St. *John* in the passage above-cited.

Upon the whole, is not this allusion confirmed by another very remarkable reference in this vision to an historical fact of the greatest notoriety? Does not—*And the child was caught up to God, and [even] to his throne*, manifestly refer to the ascension of our blessed Lord, after he had, by his death upon the cross, compleated his victory over the *dragon*, that *old serpent* called the *Devil* and *Satan*, which deceiveth the whole world?

Of the Mark set upon CAIN.

THE author of these papers will not be surprized, if what has been hinted in the preceding essay, concerning the mark set upon *Cain*, should appear so singular, so unexampled, that it will look more like the fally of a wild imagination, than the result of sober reasoning; and, therefore, will be considered as a whimsical addition to the ridiculous conjectures upon this point, which have been almost without number. “Some imagine that God impress’d
“a letter on his forehead—a letter of the word *Abel*—the four
“letters of *Jehovah*—a letter expressing his repentance—There
“have been some that imagined that *Abel*’s dog was appointed to
“go with him wherever he went, to warn people not to kill him:
“but this does not come up to the humour of a mark set on
“*Cain*; and, therefore, other writers rather think that his face
“and forehead were leprous: others, that his mark was a wild
“aspect, and terrible rolling eyes; others say he was subject to a
“terrible trembling, so as to be scarce able to get his food to his
“mouth, a notion taken from the LXX. who translate fugitive and
“vagabond *τρέμων και τρεμων*. And there are some writers who
“have improved this conceit, by adding, that wheresoever he went,
“the earth shook and trembled round about him. But there is
“another notion of *Cain*’s mark, as good as any of the rest, name-
“ly, that he had a horn fixed on his forehead, to teach all men
“to avoid him (1).”

It is necessary, therefore, in a particular manner to consider, what the late learned Dr. *Shuckford*, and from him, the authors of

(1) *Shuckford’s Connection of Sacred and Prophane History*, Vol. I. p. 8.

the Universal History, have so positively asserted on this subject, against the literal acceptation of the express words of *Moses*—*And the Lord set a mark upon Cain.*

“ *Abel* was more virtuous than his brother; and when they
 “ brought their offerings, his sacrifice was accepted beyond *Cain's*.
 “ *Cain* hereupon took a private opportunity, and out of envy and
 “ malice killed him.—After *Cain* had been so wicked as to kill
 “ his brother, God was pleased to pass a just sentence upon him;
 “ his aim was to have made himself great and flourishing, in fa-
 “ vour with God, and credit with men, without any one to stand
 “ in competition with him; but he was disappointed in every par-
 “ ticular he aimed at, for his attempting to compass his designs so
 “ wickedly. The ground was sentenced not to yield him her strength,
 “ i. e. he was to be unprosperous in his tillage; and instead of being
 “ in favour with God, without a rival, he was henceforward to be
 “ bid from his face, i. e. he was not to have any longer that happy
 “ converse with the Deity, which these first ages of the world were
 “ blessed with: and he was to be a fugitive and a vagabond; so far
 “ from being able to live amongst his friends with credit and satis-
 “ faction, that the sense of what he had done should so hurry him,
 “ as to force him to retire from them to a distant part of the
 “ world, as a mischievous person, not fit to live and be endured
 “ amongst them.

“ *Cain* had, in a little time, a full conviction of his folly and
 “ wickedness. He repeats over God's sentence against himself, as
 “ acknowledging the justice of it, and withal thought so ill of him-
 “ self, and had so true a sense of his crime, as to imagine, that
 “ every one that happened on him would kill him; that mankind would
 “ rise against him, as a person not fit to be suffered to live, and in
 “ their own defence destroy him. A sense of these things moved
 “ him to a great compunction: *Is my sin* (cried he) *too great to be*
 “ for-

" *forgiven?* for this is the true sense of ver. 13. We translate the
 " words, *my punishment is greater than I can bear* : but the Hebrew
 " word [עו] *Aven*, signifies iniquity rather than punishment ; and
 " the verb [נש] *Nasha*, signifies to be forgiven, as well as to bear.
 " And the verse may be rendered either positively, *my iniquity is too*
 " *great to be forgiven*—or, by way of interrogation, *Is my iniquity*
 " *too great to be forgiven?* And this last sense is the best ; for, upon
 " *Cain's* being brought to a sorrow for his sin, God was pleased, in
 " some measure, to pardon his transgression : there was, as yet, no
 " express law against murder ; and God gave a strict charge that no
 " one, for this fact, should destroy *Cain*. Some writers make this
 " an addition to his punishment ; but I see no reason for their opi-
 " nion. As *Moses* has represented this affair, it appears that *Cain*
 " was very sorry for what he had done, and acknowledged the just
 " sentence of God against him ; but represented, that he should be
 " in continual danger of a still farther evil, namely, that it should
 " come to pass, that every one that should find him, or happen on
 " him, should kill him : hereupon he bewailed the wretched state
 " he had brought himself into, and cried, *Is my sin too great to be*
 " *forgiven?* Can I find no mercy ? No mitigation of the punish-
 " ment I have brought upon myself ? Hereupon God was pleased
 " so far to favour him, as to give orders that no one should kill
 " him, and to make him easy, by giving him assurance of it : for
 " so the words, ver. 15. which we render, *God set a mark upon*
 " *Cain*, should be interpreted. The Hebrew word *Aoth* is a sign
 " or token. The bow, Gen. ix. was to be [*Leaoth*] for a sign or
 " token, that the world should be no more destroyed by water. So
 " here, *Vejassem Jehovah le Cain*, is not as we render it—*And God*
 " *set a mark upon Cain* ; but God gave, or appointed to *Cain*, a sign
 " or token [*i. e.* to assure him] that no one should kill him. And
 " here I might observe, that there is no foundation in the original
 " for the guesses and conjectures about the mark set upon *Cain* ;
 " about which so many writers have egregiously trifled."

In justice to Dr. *Shuckford*, we have given the reader, in one view, the substance of what so learned a critic has said on this subject. An inauspicious specimen of his critical abilities in one sort of history, when in the very entrance upon his connection of sacred and prophane history, he has so wretchedly *disjoined* the several parts of this piece of sacred story.

The facts asserted by *Moses* are—*Abel*, a shepherd, and *Cain*, an husbandman, brought each of them his offering to the Lord. The Lord accepted *Abel*, and rejected *Cain*; whereupon *Cain* was very angry, and by his fell countenance, discovering deep resentment against his brother: the Lord in a mild and gentle manner expostulates the matter with him, but in vain; for *Cain* talked with *Abel*, and when they were together in a field, he rose up against *Abel* his brother, and slew him. The Lord examines the murderer concerning the bloody fact; he impudently denies it, and insolently reproaches his Maker. For this unnatural and complicated crime, for this first act of murder, *Cain* was sentenced in a very particular and exemplary manner to hard labour, a wandering solitude; to be a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth.

But because he complained to God, that his punishment was greater than he could bear, and that he was afraid every one that should find him would kill him; *the Lord said unto him—Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken of him sevenfold:* [And in consequence of this declaration, the historian adds] *And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him, should slay him:* that he went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of *Nod*; that there he had a son, and built a city, and called their names *Enoch*.

Now from this plain and simple narration, it is very evident, that there was nothing previous to the murder of *Abel* but the respective
 I offer-

offerings, the different reception *Abel* and *Cain* met with, the rage and resentment of *Cain*, and the Lord's expostulation with him. To say, therefore, with Dr. *Shuckford*, "That *Cain's* aim was to have "made himself great and flourishing, in favour with God, and "credit with men, without any to stand in competition with him," (as all this must have been previous to the murder of *Abel*) is not only to take the most unwarrantable liberty with *Moses*, but to begin his account of *Cain* with a contradiction to common sense, as well as to the express words of *Moses*; for it is absolutely impossible that *Cain* could ever think to gain favour with God, and credit with men, by the murder of his brother.

But, with great deference to this very learned critic, the canons of criticism for the writings of *Moses* and the prophets, are to be learned from the writings of *Moses* and the prophets, and the genius of the language in which they wrote. That *Aven* signifies *iniquity* in very many passages, and *Nasha* to *forgive*, as well as to *bear*, is readily admitted; but the question here is, Whether these are the senses in which they are to be taken in this place? Now the meaning, the precise meaning of every word that has more senses than one (in every language) must be determined by the context; and in the *Hebrew* tongue (1) the primary notion of the root is of peculiar use to the understanding of the various senses of any word.

Now the word *Aven*, in its primary, radical sense, signifies *iniquity*: *I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity* (2), is the language of the Judge of all the earth: but

(1) "The *Hebrew* tongue will be found to enjoy an advantage of being understood, which, perhaps, no modern language, at least, can boast of, viz. if some primary notion of a root can be discovered, which will comprehend, connect, and reconcile, all the various senses into which that root shooteth out." Preface to Dr. *Taylor's* Concordance.

(2) Isa. xlii. 11.

so close and inseparable is the connection between *iniquity* [or sin and wickedness in general] and *punishment*, that the two ideas being considered by the sacred writers in the relation of cause and effect, are very frequently expressed by one, even the same word. In which of the two senses that word is to be taken in the several places where it occurs, whether literally, for *iniquity*, sin and wickedness, or metonymically, for *punishment*, the context will determine universally. For instance—*Lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city* (1) [for he could not be consumed in the sin or wickedness of the city, of which he, and he alone, was not guilty]—*And they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity* (2): that this is the true rendering, is evident; because their iniquities, and the iniquity of their fathers, in which they were threatened to pine away, was their despising God's statutes, and their souls abhorring his judgments; for how could they accept or approve *this* their iniquity, if they repented? But the accepting or approving of the just *punishment* of their iniquity would be a proof of their repentance, and entitle them to the favour of their offended God. *If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespasses which they have trespassed—If they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant* (3).—*Add iniquity to their iniquity* (4), i. e. add punishment to their punishment.

This observation will hold equally just in other words, the primary signification of which is, iniquity, transgression, or sin, where the inspired writers use those words for the punishment of sin or iniquity. Thus *Job* (5), *God layeth up his iniquity for his children*, the punishment of his iniquity. *He shall bring upon them their own iniquity* (6), the punishment of their own iniquity, or the punish-

(1) Gen. xix. 15. (2) Lev. xxvi. 41. (3) Ver. 40, 41, 42. (4) Psal. lxxix. 27.
 (5) Job xxi. 19. (6) Psal. xciv. 23.

ment due to their own iniquity. In like manner the word *Aven* is rendered *the punishment of his sins* (1). *This shall be the punishment of Egypt* (2).

As to the word *Nasha*, among its numerous significations, the primary, literal, and radical sense is, *to bear*; and when metaphorically taken, it signifies *to forgive*, it still preserves its relation to the primary, literal, and radical sense; for it then signifies *to bear away the punishment* due to those whose sins are forgiven; and in this bearing or taking away the punishment, consists the formal nature or essence of pardon, or forgiveness, whatever the words may be that the inspired writers make use of, or however *Nasha* be rendered by our translators.

Thus 2 Sam. xxiv. 10. *Take away the iniquity* [bear away the punishment of the iniquity] *of thy servant*. And in Isa. xxvii. 9. *to take away* [to remove] *his sin*. Thus likewise our translators, with propriety, render Hosea xiv. 2. *Take away all iniquity*.

Since, therefore, the sense of words is various in different situations, in every passage where *Nasha*, from its connection with the context, cannot be taken in a figurative, it must necessarily be understood in its original, literal sense. It would be endless to refer the reader to passages of this kind; I shall therefore mention but one, where not only the verb signifies *to bear* or *suffer*, but the noun is used three times in the same verse for *punishment*: *And they shall bear the punishment of their iniquity: the punishment of the prophet shall be even as the punishment of him that seeketh after him* (3).

Now that *Aven* must signify *punishment*, and *Nasha* *to bear*, in the passage before us, will appear evident from the particulars of

(1) Lam. iii. 39.

(2) Zech. xiv. 19.

(3) Ezek. xiv. 10.

the story of *Cain*. He had been guilty of the first act of murder, the murder of his own brother; which was attended with uncommon circumstances of aggravation: if, therefore, for this crime, the Lord pronounced him cursed from the earth, which had opened her mouth to receive his brother's blood from his hand, this curse was a manifest *punishment*; and if he was further condemned to be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, this was certainly a great addition to his punishment, a load too heavy for most men to bear. But when this sentence had filled his guilty mind with the dreadful, though just apprehensions of being himself murdered by the first man that should find him, the burden was really insupportable. In these circumstances, is it possible that *Cain* should so far forget the punishment, as to think of any forgiveness of the sin which brought this punishment upon him? For he is said by Dr. *Shuckford* to have said to the Lord, *Is my sin too great to be forgiven?* But what connection is there between this reply and the sentence? Whereas, if the matter be as we have represented, according to the present translation, the connection is natural, easy, and intelligible; and this will be evident to the most common understanding, if we may be allowed, by a small transposition of the words, without the least alteration of the sense, to set the whole in its true light.

“ And *Cain* said unto the Lord, Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid, and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. MY PUNISHMENT IS GREATER THAN I CAN BEAR.”

We come now to the *mark set upon Cain*, lest any finding him should kill him, and Dr. *Shuckford*'s elaborate critique upon it.

In the writings of *Moses*, as in the epistles of St. *Paul*, there are some things hard to be understood, which not only they that are unlearned,

ed, but the very learned *wrest*, to an amazing degree. "It is remarkable," (they are the words of Dr. *Shuckford* himself) (1) "that *Moses's* account of the creation is a bare recital of facts; no shew of argument or speculation appears in it. He relates that things were created in such and such a manner, but has no attempt of argument to establish or account for any part of his relation." The same may with equal propriety be said, of his Account of the Fall, of *Cain* and *Abel*, and, in short, of every thing that he relates as an historian. Now this short account of the lives of *Cain* and *Abel*, is a bare recital of facts: *Moses* relates that *Abel* and *Cain* acted in such and such a manner, and that the Lord said and did, what *Moses* says the Lord said and did: whatever difficulties have been found, or made, by critics and commentators, in any passages of this history, or how wild and foreign soever the senses may be that have been put upon the words, the historical facts will be for ever true, whether we understand them or not. One of these facts is, that *God set a mark upon Cain*. But Dr. *Shuckford* says, God did not set a mark upon *Cain*; and attempts to support so bold an assertion, by saying—"God was, upon his [*Cain's*] being brought to a sorrow for his sin, pleased so far to favour him, as to give him assurance of it; for so the words, which we render *God set a mark upon Cain*, should be interpreted (2)." And this interpretation he founds on the use of *Aotb*, in *Gen. ix.* "The bow was to be for a sign or token, that the world should no more be destroyed by water. So here the expression is not to be rendered—and *God set a mark upon Cain*, but God gave or appointed to *Cain* a sign or token, [*i. e.* to assure him] that no one should kill him."

But this different rendering of the word cannot serve the Doctor's cause. "The *Hebrew* word is a sign or a token."—Be it so. The

(1) Preface to Connection of Sacred and Prophane History, Vol. I. p. 62.

(2) Connection, p. 7.

question will still recur, What was that sign or token [*i. e.* to assure him] that no one should kill him? The *Hebrew* word being the same in *Gen.* ix. and in the place before us, will be so far from proving that there was no mark set upon *Cain*, that it will demonstrate the justness of the present translation. That whatever it was, God did set a mark upon *Cain*; for,

After the flood, God gave, or appointed to the world, a sign, or token, that the world should no more be destroyed by water. After the murder of *Abel*, God gave or appointed to *Cain*, a sign or token, that no one should kill *Cain*: the bow was to be in the one case for a sign or token: the thing signified was, that the world should no more be destroyed by water: but in the other case, there is, by Dr. *Shuckford's* interpretation, no sign, no token at all, nothing but the thing signified, to wit, *That no one should kill Cain*. Now this is contrary to the Doctor's express words (if the plainest words express any thing) that God gave or appointed to *Cain* a sign or token. For whether the original word be rendered a mark, or a sign, or a token, the meaning (if words have any meaning) is the same: for "a mark is a token, by which any thing is known: a sign is a token of any thing, that by which any thing is known: and a token is a sign or mark (1)." Now whether it be one or other of these, it must have been a visible sign, or token, or mark; for what is not to be seen, can be no sign, no token, no mark of any thing. The token of the covenant of circumcision was a visible sign or mark in the flesh, *Gen.* xvii. 11. The token given, or appointed to *Rahab*, was a scarlet thread, or line, tied in the window, to be seen by the spies, when they should return to *Jericho*, *Josh.* ii. 12, 18. The stones taken out of *Jordan* were to be a visible sign to the children

(1) *Johnson's Dictionary*. Thus the *Χαραγμα*, the impression, which was afterwards made on the bodies of those who were enrolled in the colleges of the gods, was called the *insigne* of the god, and *insigne* is a particular mark, sign, or token, whereby any thing is known. *Ainsworth*.

of *Israel*, that they passed that river on dry ground, Chap. iv. 6. And the blood on the posts of the doors of their houses, was to be to them for a token upon their houses, where they eat the passover—*When I see the blood I will pass over you*, Exod. xii. 13, 14.

In like manner the bow was set in the cloud, *Gen.* ix. 13. was to be seen in the cloud, *ver.* 14. I will look upon it, that I may remember my covenant, &c. *ver.* 16. In the case of *Cain*, therefore, as well as in those above-mentioned, there must have been some visible sign, or token, or mark, which might be conspicuous to every eye that should see him; for the express design of setting it upon him was, lest any finding him should kill him. The sign, therefore, or token, was not, could not have been given, or appointed to or for *Cain*, to assure him (1) that no one should kill him, but to and for every man that should find him, that when they should see the mark set upon him, they should fly the wretch, not only as a mischievous person, not fit to live, and be endured among them, but as a monster in nature, as the most avowed enemy of the human race.

(1) If the word sign or token was given to assure *Cain* that no one should kill him, I would ask, what that assurance was? This the Doctor does not say, though the learned authors of the *Universal History* (who have adopted our author's sentiments on this head) think that God gave *Cain* a sign (probably by some miracle) that none that met him should take away his life, [Vol. I. 8vo edit. p. 155. Note L.] But here both the Doctor and these learned writers seem to be mistaken, in a most material circumstance of this story. The sign was (as we have said above) given, not to, or for *Cain*, but to, and for every son and daughter of *Adam*: and it is very remarkable, that all the assurance that God gave to *Cain*, that no one should kill him, was given to him before the existence of this sign, before the mark was set upon him; when, upon *Cain*'s expressing his just apprehensions of death from the first man he should meet, the Lord said, *Whoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken of him sevenfold*: for here the conversation between the Lord and *Cain* ends. And the words—*The Lord set a mark upon Cain*, are the words of the historian, and therefore cannot possibly relate to any assurance given to *Cain*, but to some visible sign to the whole human race, to point out to them the person, whose death was so severely to be avenged; because, without some very distinguishing mark, any one of the rising generation, not knowing the person of this murderer, might, through ignorance, have killed him.

But it will be said, (and that with great justness) if there was any real mark set upon *Cain*, there must have been some plain and evident connection between that mark or sign, and the thing signified by it (as is the case in every one of those signs mentioned above); for whatever the mark was, if it carried not in it, to every one that should find him, something equivalent to a positive prohibition not to kill him, it could never have answered the express design of the Lord's setting it upon him. It is true, nothing of this kind has been, or can be said, of any of the numerous marks which have hitherto been (and for this very reason) ridiculously enough fancied: but if our conjecture (and every man may claim the liberty of throwing in his opinion with the rest) be founded in reason, and can be supported by the strongest allusions to similar facts, recorded both in sacred and prophane history, the connection between such a mark, and not killing the man thus stigmatized, will appear as easy and natural as it would be visible.

For if (as we have supposed, see the Paraphrase, p. 102.) the FIGURE of a SERPENT, or the NAME serpent, was impressed on the body of *Cain*, such a stigma would naturally recall to the minds of all who should find him, the promise of the seed of the woman—bring to their remembrance the enmity that was foretold should subsist between the two families, and abundantly confirm their faith in the promised Saviour, when they should see this murderer of his brother thus pointed out to them by the very finger of God, as the seed of the serpent. And as it was well known (for *Lamech*, one of *Cain's* descendants, knew it) that the Lord had, on the severest penalty, forbid any one to kill him, nothing could so effectually prevent the avenging of that blood which cried so loud for vengeance, as the figure of, or the name Serpent, impressed on his forehead.

Such is the connection between the mark, and the reason why it was impressed on so conspicuous a part of his body; great, therefore,

fore, is the propriety of what *Moses* has said on this obscure subject — *That the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him, should kill him.*

Thus have we endeavoured, in justice to *Moses*, to vindicate the literal sense of this text, from the gross misrepresentations of so learned a critick; and though we are far from charging him with the consequences of his opinion concerning *Cain's* being, in any measure, pardoned, and received into favour with God; yet this I must say, If this first act of violence, this first murder, attended with such aggravations, was so easily forgiven; and if God, who never yet suffered murder to go unpunished, *did so far* favour this murderer, as to give orders that no one should kill him, might not this blasphemous conclusion be drawn from such premises, “That murder in the beginning was established by a law: and that instead of the murderer of a good man, those who should dare to kill that murderer, should be most severely punished?”

The author of these papers is not conscious to himself of having advanced any thing in this History of *Cain* and *Abel*, that is not agreeable to the representation which *Moses* has given us, or that is not fairly deducible from the text and context, except in relation to the mark which he supposes was set upon *Cain*.

But before his conjecture, however singular it may appear, be condemned, let us suppose that this mark was the figure of a serpent, or the name serpent, impressed by God on the forehead of *Cain*; and then let us see whether, from the manifest references and allusions to some ancient signature or mark, which are to be found both in the *Old* and *New Testament*, we may not, with the highest degree of probability, conclude, that they were in reality references and allusions to this piece of ancient history.

On the supposition, therefore, of such a fact, give me leave to observe, that there seems to me to be a double design in this mark set upon *Cain*, one of which *Moses* expressly mentions—*lest any finding him, should kill him*; the other was to let the then world know whose seed, whose son, whose servant he was (1), and no mark could have been more significative, or more strikingly expressive, than the figure, or the name of a serpent, to point out the seed of that serpent, between whom, and the seed of the woman, the threatened enmity had so apparently discovered itself.

Now it is very remarkable, that agreeable to this double design of the mark set upon *Cain*, there seems to be a twofold [double] allusion to this mark [if this mark was] set upon *Cain*, corresponding to this twofold design.

The prophet *Ezekiel*, in one of his visions, when the destruction of the city and temple of *Jerusalem* was at hand, represents six men appearing, with slaughter-weapons in their hands; and one among them, with a writer's ink-horn by his side, was commanded to go through the midst of *Jerusalem*, and to set a *mark* upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations done in the midst thereof. To the others he said, slay utterly old and young—but come not near any upon whom is the mark (2). Here is a plain and manifest allusion to the express design which *Moses* mentions of the mark set upon *Cain*, for the security of his person, lest any finding him should kill him. But in the writings of St. *John*, the mark set on the foreheads, or on the right hands

(1) “ In the same manner as at *Athens*, slaves were commonly stigmatized in their forehead, with the name, or some peculiar character belonging to their masters. Soldiers were branded in the hand, and with the name or character of their general. After the same manner it was likewise customary to stigmatize the worshippers and votaries of some of the gods.” *Potter's Antiquities*, Vol. I. p. 65.

(2) *Ezek. ix.*

of those, who, in the prophetic style, are said to worship the beast, was as manifestly to distinguish his votaries from the servants of the true God, *Apoc.* xiii. 16. *Save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name, ver. 17. And receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, xiv. 9, 11. The victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, xv. 2. The men which had the mark of the beast, xvi. 2. xix. 20. Neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, xx. 4. And in chap. vii. 3. the allusion is to both these designs of the mark—Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads.*

It is readily admitted, that arguments for facts, or in support of supposed facts, are not to be drawn from such writings as are professedly obscure; yet, in the darkest prophecies, there may be references and allusions to some historical facts, recorded in the earliest writers (1). There are many such in the *Apocalyp*s, which plainly refer to the History of the Fall: but these I have mentioned in this place, are bare allusions to one single circumstance in the story of Cain, which appear to me in so strong a light, that I cannot but conclude, that from these alone we may, with the greatest degree of probability, collect—*That a real, a visible mark was set upon Cain, even upon his forehead, [the most conspicuous part of his body] or on his right hand, for the purposes specified above. And that this mark was the figure, or the image, or the name of that serpent in the garden of Eden, who deceived the mother of mankind; and who, in process of time, became the object of the most abominable idolatry that ever prevailed in the world.*

Strange as this conclusion may sound in the ears of the reader, let him indulge the writer in attempting to defend it. He is sen-

(1) "Allusions to customs lost to us—must needs continue several passages in the 'dark to us.'" Preface to *Lacke's Essay on St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 110.

fible of the great opposition it will meet with from the learned, but that ought not to discourage one that is in the search of truth alone.

Commentators, it is true, and critics of the greatest name, do say,
 " That the passages in *Apocal.* vii. 3. and in the parallel places,
 " are allusions to a custom in the East, of stigmatizing servants in
 " the forehead (1) with the names of their masters, and soldiers
 " with those of their generals.

But with submission to so great authorities, the question with me is, not to what the whole body of critics refer the words of the apostle, but to what the spirit of God alludes. We must, therefore, go higher in our inquiries, and ask whence sprung that ancient usage of fixing a mark, or inscribing the name of a master, or general, on soldiers, or servants? There must have been, most certainly, some fact, prior to these ancient usages, some original mark fixed on some personage, and upon some uncommon occasion (though lost to the heathen, and entirely overlooked by the christian world) that could give rise to so very unnatural and barbarous a custom.

Now if there is a fact of so great antiquity, so remarkable in its circumstances, recorded by an inspired writer, as is this in the story of

(1) Signamus in fronte—quia is mos erat in oriente dominorum nomina servis in fronte scribere. Servants of old were stigmatized in the forehead with their master's mark. *Martial*, L. II. Epig. 29. L. III. Epig. 21. L. VIII. Epig. 75. *Senec.* de Ira, L. III. Cap. 3. Vide *Daubuz* on the Revelations, p. 319.

Allusio est ad priscum ritum quo servi & milites ejus cui fidem suam addixerunt stigmati notari & nomina inscribi solebant. *Poli Synopsis*.

" 'Twas the custom of the *Roman* generals to cause the soldiers enrolled to have a
 " mark on their hands. So *Seneca*, *Epist.* 51. *Daubuz*, ut supra, p. 320. *Lucian*,
 " speaking of the votaries of the *Syrian* goddess, affirms they were all branded with
 " certain marks, some in the palms of their hands, and others in their necks;
 " whence it became customary for all the *Assyrians* thus to stigmatize themselves."
Potter's Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 65.

Cain, may we not presume, that the spirit of God, under whose direction St. *John* wrote, did, in these passages, refer and allude to this original fact, rather than to those customs in the *East*, and elsewhere?

For, I. There was another, and a more remarkable custom practised in *Egypt*, and which prevailed in the *Roman* empire, that will throw a great deal of light on this dark subject; what I mean, is, that of men's wearing on their body some *mark*, as a *badge* of the god which they adored.

" *Ptolemy Philopater*, by a decree, ordered, that all the *Jews* of *Alexandria* should be enrolled; and that at the time of their enrollment, they should have the mark of an *ivy leaf*, the badge of his god *Bacchus*, by an hot iron impressed upon them (1); and that all those who should refuse to be thus enrolled and stigmatized with the said mark, should be made slaves; and if any of them should stand out against this decree, he should be put to death. He himself was marked with this badge; for which reason they gave him the nick-name of *Gallus*, because the priests called *Galli* were so marked (2)."

The same custom so far prevailed among the *Romans*, "that there was no one in the empire who was not admitted into some one college of their gods; and upon his admission, did not receive in his body some *Χαρασμα*, or impression; either the mark or the name of the god, or the numeral letters expressive of that name (3). Accordingly, they had three methods of marking those who were enrolled in these colleges, by some hieroglyphic mark, as thunder, a trident; a helmet, a wand with two snakes

(1) Τότες τε ἀπογραφόμενος Χαρασθεῖται, καὶ διαπυρὸς εἰς τὸ σῶμα παρασημῶ διαγυῖται κισσοφυλλῶ, 3 *Mac.* II. 29.

(2) *Prideaux's Connect.* Vol. II. p. 108. 8vo edit.

(3) *Poli Synopf.* in *Apocal.* xiii. 16. *Poli Synopf.* ut supra. *Potter's Antiq.* Vol. I. p. 66.

“twisted about it, was impressed on them, signifying *Jupiter, Neptune, Mars, Mercury*—Thus an ivy leaf was impressed on those of the society or college of *Bacchus*. Or, 2d, the names of the gods were imprinted on them, as *Jupiter, Mars, Bacchus*. Or, 3d, instead of the names the number, which the sum of the *Greek* letters made, under which the mystical name of the god was veiled—(1) Thus the sun, who was signified by the number DCVIII. is said to be represented by these two numeral letters XH. But customs of this kind prevailed before the time of *Moses*, who in a most solemn manner forbids the children of *Israel* to print any marks upon themselves. This usage, therefore, must have been very antient, prior to any *Greek* or *Roman* writer (2). *After the doings of the land of Egypt wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances*, Lev. xviii. 3. *Ye shall not print any marks upon you: I am the Lord*, xix. 28. And if *Moses* was the first writer that mentions the printing of marks on the bodies of men for idolatrous purposes, is it not more than probable, that all the idolatrous stigmata practised by the *Egyptians, Canaanites*, as well as those that afterwards prevailed in the world, were traditional references to this remarkable piece of sacred history in the life of *Cain*.

For, II. Both the apostle and the historian (according to our interpretation of the mark set upon *Cain*) speak of the same thing, to

(1) Poli Synopf. ut supra. *Potter's Antiq.* Vol. I. p. 66.

(2) That *Moses*, in this passage, refers to customs in use in his own times, is evident from the reason of the prohibition of such an idolatrous rite, which was practised by the nations whose land they were going to possess, to wit, because God would not have his own people agree with idolaters in any of their abominable customs. “*Theodoret* is likewise of this opinion, that the *Jews* were forbidden to brand themselves with stigmata, because the idolaters, by that ceremony, used to consecrate themselves to their false deities.” *Potter*, ut supra, p. 65.

wit,

wit, of the mark of a beast; not of the name of a man, not of the name of a master, or a general, but the mark or impression, or the number of the name of a beast; and not only of a beast in general, but of *The Beast*: and what other beast in the whole creation was ever so much distinguished as an object of religious worship as the serpent (1)? If, therefore, St. *John* describes the apostates from the true religion as receiving the mark of the beast, who received his power from the dragon, and the servants of God as receiving the seal of God in their forehead; what allusion can be so natural, expressive and striking, as this to the mark set upon *Cain*? And if this be admitted, it will abundantly confirm our sentiment concerning this mark, and justify the deduction we shall make from the history of *Cain*, of the idolatrous uses he put this stigma to, as soon as ever he had it in his power, to wit, to perpetuate his enmity to the woman and her seed, by setting up the serpent as an object of religious worship, and instituting sacred rites to the honour of the new god, whose badge he wore in his own body.

But as we have hitherto argued only on a supposition, that the mark set upon *Cain* was the figure of, or the name, *Serpent*; yet,

(1) "I need not prove how great an object of idolatry the serpent has been. It is well known what the case was in *Egypt*, in the *Eastern* countries, in *Greece* and *Rome*, and elsewhere. This species of idolatry, however it came there, was found in *America*, upon the first discovery of that country. *Garcilaso del Vigo*, who wrote the History of the *Incas* of *Peru*, tells us, that the *Spaniards* forcing into the recesses of one of their temples, found there the image of a great dragon, placed as the deity of the temple, and the object of religious worship. Other instances in abundance might be produced from modern, as well as ancient history." Dr. *Sherlock's* Appendix to Dissert. II. p. 280. *Diabolus* ea forma maxime colitur qua seduxit primos homines Bochart. *Hierozoicæ*, Tom. I. col. 22. *Serpens* in nulla non gente seu *Græca*, seu *Barbara*, sacer fuit sane in gentium mysteriis satis ex *Justino Martyre*, *Clement. Alexandrino*, *Julio Firmico*, atque aliis constat: nec uni numini dicato: ut ex *Artimodoro* cognoscimus, *Jovi*, *Soli*, *Cereri*, *Proserpinæ*, *Æsculapio* & heroibus: usque adeo feliciter diabolo successit, ut qua specie primis illuserat parentibus ea deinceps quoque gentes omnes a veri *Dei* cultu avocaret. *Vossii Idolol.* Tom. II. R. 395,

where

where we want the means of coming to the highest degree of certainty, may we not be allowed to argue from the circumstances in which *Cain* found himself after his discovery of that stigma, and the probable steps he may reasonably be supposed to have taken after that discovery; and the degree of probability will appear to be in proportion to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the supposed circumstances, and to their having any, or no, foundation in the *Mosaic* account of his life and actions.

Now there seems to be some remarkable analogy between the algebraic investigation of an unknown quantity in an equation, and the investigation of this supposed unknown stigma. The probable circumstances in which *Cain* found himself after his discovery of the mark set upon him, and the probable steps a man of his character would naturally take in such circumstances, answer to the terms of an equation, *i. e.* to the several quantities or parts that are known; the mark itself corresponds to the root, which denotes the value of the unknown quantity in the equation.

To investigate, therefore, this unknown mark, we must carefully attend to those circumstances of *Cain*, and to his actions, consequent upon those circumstances; and if we can fill up the intervals of time between these two facts recorded by *Moses*, to wit, the Lord's setting a mark upon *Cain*, and *Cain*'s settling in the land of *Nod*, agreeable to the nature of these facts, and to the character of *Cain*, may we not, with the highest degree of probability, conclude, that this mark was in reality the *figure*, or the *name* of, a *serpent*; and then it will naturally follow, that *Cain* was the original author of that idolatrous worship that has been paid to the serpent, and consequently that all the idolatrous stigmata that ever have been in use, took their rise from this *mark* set upon *Cain*, in the character of the *seed of the serpent*.

But

But to lead the reader into these circumstances, and to shew their connection with those that preceded previous to *Cain's* receiving this mark, give me leave, briefly, to recapitulate his story:

The promise of a seed to our first parents was included in, and was the principal part of, the sentence passed on the serpent. This promise was thought by *Eve*, to have been fulfilled in the birth of *Cain*, when at his birth she said, I have gotten a MAN the LORD. *Cain*, bred up in this erroneous opinion, considered himself as the heir of the promise, as the LORD, the SAVIOUR. But the murder of his brother, consequent upon *Abel* and his offerings being accepted, demonstrated, even to himself, that instead of being the *promised seed* of the woman, he was the *threatned seed* of the serpent.

In this character he seems to have been adjudged to a life of infamy, and to have been permitted to fill up the measure of his enmity to the true seed of the woman. And in this character he will evidently appear to have acted, if he should profess himself to be the servant of this new master, this new god, by openly espousing his cause, whose badge he wore in his own body.

Now if this mark was the figure, or the name of a serpent, it was the most infamous part of his punishment, and must have been peculiarly mortifying to him; who, from the circumstances of his birth and education, had thought of nothing less than of being the lord of the whole world.

In such a situation, from the highest expectations of power and grandeur, to be fallen to the abject state of a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, of a branded villain, self-banished from the society of every son of *Adam*; without any hopes, or even a wish to be reconciled to God or man, whence could he possibly receive any, even the least alleviation to his consummate wretchedness, but from the
grati-

gratification of his unconquerable passions? Would not rage, and the deepest resentment, naturally prompt him to pursue his enmity to the utmost, not only against the seed of the woman, but against the adorable Author of that promised salvation, which himself had so notoriously trampled under foot? Would not pride, and ambition, as naturally spur him on to recognize his near relation to the serpent as his father?

To a mind thus prepared, such considerations might, no doubt, suggest some probable means of executing so revengeful a scheme; but as it is more agreeable to the known character of the Old Serpent, and to the event of things, to ascribe to the depths of Satan, that horrid plan of power, which, as the Prince of this world, he had formed for himself, we shall consider *Cain* chiefly as a tool, a mere under-worker in this new plot.

For though *Moses* makes no more mention of the *serpent*, after the merciful expulsion of our first parents, it cannot be imagined that he would rest satisfied with his last (1) disappointment in the garden, and remain an idle spectator of what had happened to *Cain*; we cannot conceive he would let slip so favourable an opportunity, that the mark set upon *Cain* afforded him, of setting up his throne in the world in opposition to that of the *Son of God*, by asserting his right to this world and all its glories, and promising *Cain*, that if he would fall down and worship him, all should be his.

It is certain, that upon these terms, the tempter tried the Son of God; but though the Prince of this world had nothing in him, yet as he found all that he could wish for in *Cain*, is it not most reasonable to imagine, that it was on these very terms the serpent formed the like temptation?

(1) See Appendix to the Tree of Life, p. 97—99.

We know not in what shape the tempter appeared to our blessed Saviour, nor is it of any moment; but as the body of a serpent had been so conducive to his success in *Eden*, as he was condemned in the character of a serpent; and as *Cain* was considered as the true seed of the serpent; and as all the success of the tempter depended on a proper use of the same outward form, in making it subservient to his grand design, we think (and it was a master-piece of policy) that when *Cain* was on his journey to the land of *Nod*, the tempter appeared to him in the form of a serpent, and by perverting the use of the judicial stigma set upon him, laid the foundation of introducing a kind of ophiocracy in the world.

By what means this effect might be produced, the general plan of action will discover, when we consider—That *Moses* tells us, *Cain* had a wife in the land of *Nod*. *Cain*, therefore, was married before God had set the mark upon him, before he dwelt in that land, for there she conceived and bare *Enoch*. This single circumstance would naturally diffuse a dawn of hope in the mind of *Cain*, and at the same time furnish the tempter with the fairest opportunity of acting up to the character of *Satan*, the *Adversary*, from the consideration of the promise of a seed to *Adam*, included in the sentence on the serpent: for as all the hopes that *Adam* could entertain of a reconciliation to the favour of his offended maker, centred in a son that was to be given him, so all the expectation that *Cain*, or the serpent, could possibly have, of prosecuting their enmity to the seed of the woman, and of gratifying their pride, ambition, and revenge, absolutely depended on *Cain's* having a son.

Now this general plan seems to have been, that as soon as *Cain* should have a son, he should dedicate this son to the serpent, and make the judicial mark, with which he was branded, the distinguishing mark of his future family, by impressing the same on every

one of his own children, in the manner of the *Ancient Britains* (1); and that these children, as soon as they should be capable of instruction, should be initiated in the principles of the doctrine of enmity to the woman and her promised seed; and when arrived to a proper age, solemnly take upon themselves the profession of a new religion, to be established in honour of the *serpent*. And in process of time, if any of the sons of *Adam* should become proselytes to this new institution, they should receive in their right hand, or in their foreheads, the same distinguishing mark, as the badge of their master, their general, or the god, in whose service they, by this act, had devoted themselves.

Now this opinion concerning the origin of idolatrous worship, how conjectural soever it may appear, we think is supported by this single passage in the History of the Life of *Cain*, after he had settled in the land of *Nod*: “And *Cain* knew his wife, and she bare “*Enoch*: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, “after the name of his son, *Enoch*.” *Enoch* is, according to *Buxtorf*, *initiauit, primum imbuit, dedicauit*. Dr. *Taylor* renders it, “Initiare, “dedicare; to initiate, imbue or season, applied to the first instruction of children, *Prov.* xxii. 6. to season or instruct, at the mouth “or entrance of his way——”Tis also applied to the first use of a “new thing, as of a common house—of the temple—of the wall “of *Jerusalem*—of an altar; which first using of such things, being “the setting them apart in a solemn manner to their proper ends, “is called the dedicating of them (2).”

(1) “The Ancient Britains [tenellis infantibus notas certasque figuras animalium ardenti ferro imprimebant] imprinted upon the bodies of their infants the “figures of animals, and other marks, with hot irons. [Lucas de Linda descript. “orbis] The same is likewise affirmed by *Tertull.* [de celand. Virg.] and *Clau-dian* [de Bello Getic] mentions the same custom.” Ferroque notatas perlegit ex-fanguis picto moriente figuras. *Potter's Antiq.* Vol. I. p. 65.

(2) *Taylor's Concordance.*

If, therefore, *Cain*, at the birth of his son, called him *Enoch*—initiated, dedicated, he must have been initiated into some service, which he was to perform whenever he should be capable of that service: he must have been dedicated to some being, not to God; for his father had banished himself from the place of God's worship, and there was no other alternative but the serpent, to whom *Cain* had devoted himself, whose cause he served, and whose image he wore in his own body. Can the name *Enoch*, therefore, bear any other sense than that he was initiated into the same service? dedicated, or consecrated to the same being with his father? And if so, is it not reasonable to conclude, that by the ceremony of imprinting on his tender body the figure of a serpent, *Cain* set the child apart in a solemn manner, to pursue the enmity which he had begun, and was determined to carry on, to the utmost, against the promised deliverer?

Thus we see the remarkable propriety of the name of the first-born of the seed of the serpent; a name so singular, that there is no other word in the *Hebrew* language, by which to express the dedication or consecration of a person or thing.

This thought will naturally lead us to the political reason of the name of the city which *Cain* builded; he called the name of the city after the name of his son, *Enoch*; the name is one: the reason, therefore, of the name of the son, and of the city, must be the same; the son was named *Enoch*, because he was *initiated, dedicated*: the city was called *Enoch*, because it was the city of the initiated—the dedicated city; every one of that community wearing the badge of the serpent.

We have here another instance of the peculiarity which has before been observed in the writings of *Moses*, which alone (ab-

stracting from any consideration of his being inspired) may be looked upon as the great characteristic that distinguishes him from every other ancient writer, and it is this—"That notwithstanding the
 " extreme conciseness of his History, from that of Creation, to his
 " Account of the Division of the Earth in the Days of *Peleg*, there
 " is, in almost every period, some one passage, at least, which is a
 " key to some interesting part of the narration." Such, in this account of the birth of *Cain's* son, and his building a city, is the name *Enoch*, *initiated*, *dedicated*. The child was the initiated, the dedicated child; the city was the dedicated city, the city of the initiated.

It will add no inconsiderable weight to this argument from the name *Enoch*, if we attend to the practice of *Seth* and his friends. The words of *Moses* are, "And to *Seth*, to him also was born a son, and he called his name *Enos*." The primary signification of which word is, to be sick unto death, to be in a desperate incurable condition, desperately wicked. Thus, by calling his son *Enos*, *Seth* seems to have expressed a lively sense of the desperate and deplorable state of religion, from the open apostasy of *Cain* and his family. Now as *Cain* had dedicated his son and his city to the *serpent*, and thereby had separated them, and all who should adhere to him, from the rest of mankind; they who were the servants of God, and professed the religion of *Adam*, did, though in another manner, dedicate themselves to the God whom they served; for then began men [not to call upon, but] to call themselves by the name of the Lord (1). Accordingly we find that these are styled by *Moses*, *The sons of God* (2), in contradistinction to [not only the sons of *Cain*, but] those sons of *Adam* who were born to him, after he had begotten *Seth*.

(1) Gen. iv. 26.

(2) Ibid. vi. 2, 4.

These were the men, whose beautiful daughters were the occasion of that general violence and corruption, that brought upon the world as general a destruction. And it is not to be doubted, that, to stem the tide of this prevailing degeneracy of mankind, *Jared*, the fourth from *Enos*, did, in a solemn manner, dedicate his son to the Lord, when he called his name *Enoch*.

THE CONCLUSION.

WHAT has been advanced on this interesting subject, will appear worthy of the critical examination of the learned, when we consider the probable steps that *Cain* took to carry his favourite scheme into execution.

As soon as ever *Cain* had discovered that the figure of a *serpent*, or the name *serpent*, was impressed on his forehead, it would naturally bring to his mind those words of the sentence pronounced on the serpent—*I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed*—he would necessarily look upon this mark as a demonstration to himself, as well as to the world, that he was the person pointed out, under the character of the seed of the serpent. For though *Moses* says—*The Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him*; yet the Lord had declared to him that no one should kill him, before he set any mark upon him. The primary design, therefore, of this stigma could not be mentioned by *Moses*, since he is silent concerning the particular mark, which seems to have been to brand him as the seed, the true seed of the serpent.

Now before this mark was set upon him, *Cain* had complained to God, that his punishment was greater than he could bear; but this was the language of gross *hypocrisy*: for when this public and lasting infamy was added to the burden, we hear of no farther

complaint, though that alone would have been insupportable to any mind but his, so like to that of his father——

“ A mind not to be chang'd by place or time (1),

“ But what will not ambition and revenge

“ Descend to? Who aspires, must down as low

“ As high he soar'd; obnoxious first or last

“ To basest things (2).”

He who had been so greatly disappointed in his former vain pretensions to the title of the promised seed, seems, upon the discovery of this mark, to have determined, as soon as it should be in his power (for as yet he had no son) openly to act in his now-undisguised character of the seed of the serpent. With this resolution he went out from the presence of the Lord; his wife (for she went with him into the land of his wandering) was now the only human creature he could converse with; and as she was the partner of his infamy, as a sharer in his punishment, it is highly probable that they took the first opportunity to

“ Consult how they might henceforth most offend

“ Their enemy, their own loss how repair,

“ How overcome this dire calamity,

“ What reinforcement they might gain from hope,

“ If not, what resolution from despair (3).”

But be this as it may, without her he could do nothing; for as all the hopes of *Adam* were entirely founded in a seed promised to bruise the head of the serpent, *Cain's* only expectation was from a seed promised to him as the seed of the serpent, to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman.

(1) *Milton*, Book I. l. 253.

(2) Book IX. l. 168.

(3) Book I. l. 187.

Now the general plan of action, as mentioned above, was simple and plain, to wit, to make the judicial stigma set upon himself, a political badge for his future family, by imprinting the image of a serpent on the foreheads of every one of his children, and causing them, by the same ceremony, to perpetuate the distinction throughout their generations.

By this single step, he would take off the odium of this ignominious stigma from his own person, and by confining it to his own family, might turn it into a badge of honour (1). This piece of policy would furnish him with the means of indulging his favourite passions, ambition, and revenge; ambition—in setting up himself as the civil head of a party, in an interest directly opposite to that of his father; and revenge—by instituting sacred rites in honour of the serpent.

Thus *Cain* became both the civil and ecclesiastical head of half a world. The beginning of his kingdom was *Enoch*; for he builded not this city to secure himself from any violence from the sons of *Adam*, but to form a distinct and regular community of his own descendants, and others that might become profelytes to his new religion, who should be united as one man, under him, as their king and priest, and therefore he builded the city, and called the city after the name of his son, ENOCH, INITIATED, DEDICATED.

If, therefore, every inhabitant of this first city was, by this mark being impressed on their bodies, initiated into the fellowship or col-

(1) This custom [of stigmatizing slaves in the forehead] was the greatest mark of infamy that could be inflicted on them. On the contrary, in *Thrace*, *Herodotus* tells us, it was accounted a badge of honour, and used by none but persons of credit, nor omitted but by those of the meanest rank. Το μὲν ἐσιγθαί εὐσεβεῖς κερπίται, το δὲ ἀσιγλόν, ἀσεβεῖς to be stigmatized, says he, is reputed a mark of quality; to want which, is a disgrace. *Potter*, ut supra, Vol. I. p. 65,

THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE. 23

double name of the tree, which was to be the test of man's obedience. If the command concerning it under this double name, be considered as a law properly so called, the sanction of reward is expressed, and promised in the name, *tree of life*: if it be considered as a covenant, life is promised in that name; and the tree itself was the token of that covenant, and so long as that covenant should have continued unbroken, it would have been a pledge, and an earnest of life; and if it should have for ever remained unbroken, it would have been a sure and certain pledge and earnest of continued life or immortality, as the gracious reward of continued innocence, that is, of never-ceasing obedience. And this remarkable citation from *Moses*, will fix and for ever determine the true meaning of the other name of the tree, by which it was forbidden, to wit, the tree of the KNOWLEDGE (1), the tree of the CHOICE, of good and evil.

That the nature of this tree has been almost universally misunderstood, is very evident from the almost universal opinion, that there were in *Eden* two peculiar and remarkable trees, till the Rev. Mr. (now Dr.) *Kennicott* published a dissertation on the tree of life in paradise, in which he endeavoured to prove the contrary: And in consequence of this opinion, it is almost universally maintained, that the use of the tree of life was to render, or preserve man immortal. " 'Tis certain," says the great Dr. BULL, " the tree of life was so called, because it was either a sacrament and divine sign, or else a natural means of immortality; that is, because he that should have used it would (either by the natural virtue of the tree itself continually repairing the decays of nature, or else by

(1) And thou, *Solomon*, my son, *know, choose*, thou the God of thy fathers, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 9.

You only have I *known, chosen*, of all the families of the earth, *Amos* iii. 2.

Behold thou desireth truth in the inward parts, and in the hidden parts thou shalt make me to *know*, to *choose*, and approve wisdom, *Psal.* li. 6.

The Lord knoweth, approveth, the way of the righteous, *Psal.* i. 6.

" the

"the power of God) have lived for ever, as God himself plainly affures us." *Gen. iii. 22, 23, 24. (1).*

The learned Dr. KING goes further, and says, "Not that any tree, by any natural virtue, could preserve us immortal; but since God commanded man to eat of it, as often as he needed to be restored in his body, he surely was ready and able to convey his supernatural assistance, and make it effectual to the design for which it was appointed (2)."

That there was but one tree, has, we hope, been demonstrated beyond the possibility of a doubt: and that the tree of life was so far from being appointed, and in consequence of that appointment, commanded to be eat of, as often as man needed to be restored in his body, that it was solemnly forbid to be tasted, on pain of death: this has likewise been proved from the double name of the tree: but since the woman describes the forbidden tree by its situation alone, the tree in the midst of the garden, let us, for argument's sake, drop both the names of the tree, and let us suppose, that for the trial of man's obedience, God had planted a single tree in the midst of the garden, not distinguished from the rest, by any name, and had commanded the man, saying, "of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree in the midst of the garden, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Now it is extremely evident that this command would have been as binding, and the threatening of death as peremptory as if the tree had been forbidden by the name of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

7 DE 61

Let me therefore ask, what would have been the consequence, if neither *Eve*, nor her husband with her, had eat of the fruit of

(1) Sermons and Discourses, Vol. III. p. 1069.

(2) Sermon on the Fall of Man, second edit. p. 60.

lege of the serpent, it is most probable, that in this city, the serpent first became the object of that abominable idolatrous worship, which, after the flood, overspread so great a part of the known world. For, notwithstanding the loss the serpent sustained by the flood, he wanted not a seed to supply the place of *Cain*, whilst *Ham* was preserved in the ark: he soon discovered the temper and disposition (though he carried not in his forehead the mark) of the serpent, when he exposed the nakedness of his father.

THE END.

THE COMMISSION

7 DE 61

7 DE 61

THE END

